3.

# THE LETTERS OF GUATIMOZIN, ON THE AFFAIRS OF *IRELAND*,

AS FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE FREEMAN's JOURNAL,

AND WHICH HAVING BEEN SINCE RE-PRINTED IN LONDON, HAVE GONE THROUGH SEVERAL EDITIONS THERE.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED, THE

# LETTERS OF CAUSIDICUS,

THAT ACCOMPANIED THE ESSAYS OF GUATIMOZIN IN THEIR FIRST APPEARANCE.

BELFAST:

PRINTED BY HENRY AND ROBERT JOY.

M,DCC,LXXIX.

" Day by day, the Mexicans, forced to retire
" as the Spaniards gained ground, were hemmed
" in within more narrow limits. GUATIMOZIN,
" though unable to ſtop the career of the enemy,
" continued to defend his capital with obſtinate
" reſolution, and diſputed every inch of ground.
" ---He rejected, with ſcorn, every overture of
" peace from CORTES, and, diſdaining the idea
" of ſubmitting to the oppreſſors of his country,
" determined not to ſurvive its ruin."

*Robertſon*'s Hiſt. of America, V. II. B. 5th.

THE

# LETTERS

OF

# GUATIMOZIN, &c.

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER I.

*To the* PEOPLE *of* IRELAND, *in* general, *and of the* CITY *of* DUBLIN *in* particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

THERE is in the affairs of nations, as of individuals, a tide, or current, which ſometimes ſets in towards the harbour of good-fortune, and the occaſion of which, being once miſſed, is never perhaps recalled. Such, with regard to Ireland, do I conceive the preſent moment to be. During a ſpace of nearly ſix hundred years, that ſhe hath been united to an unnatural ſiſter, ſhe has expe-

rienced nothing but adverſity and oppreſſion; inſomuch that the meaſure of her misfortunes will not now contain another. The rapacity of England over Ireland hath received its limits in the poverty of this country; there is not left wherewithal to gratify the avarice of another Engliſhman, ruined at home by the luxury and diſſipation of his own country. The weight of that eſtabliſhment, which Britiſh wantonneſs has encreaſed without neceſſity, in this ill-fated country, muſt now be ſupported by *Britiſh reſources*; for an exhauſted treaſury, and an univerſally-failing revenue, have proclaimed *us* unequal to the burden.

A trade limited to the exportation of a ſingle manufacture, whilſt it forbids us to profit of the moſt unbounded advantages, which nature, perhaps, ever beſtowed on any country, binds us likewiſe in the neceſſity of conſuming, even for our own uſe, the manufactures of our tyrants, to whom knack and univerſal markets have given a general ſuperiority. 'Tis thus that England in the extravagance of her oppreſſion of this kingdom, not only precludes us from the opportunities of gathering ſuſtenance, with the other nations of Europe, from the common harveſt of commerce, but ſhe compels us, miſerable as we are, to contribute largely to her profuſion.

If any man ſhall ſay that this ſlight ſketch of our condition is a *caricature*, let the thouſands of ſtarving manufacturers in our ſtreets bear witneſs that the *drawing* is after nature. The misfortunes of Ireland are lamented by all her children; how comes it then that there is none will point out a remedy? Is the ſpirit of the nation ſo broken by adverſity

adverſity, that our feelings ſuggeſt nothing but deſpair? I hope not; and it is in confidence of this hope, that I mean to dedicate ſome hours *weekly*, to this ſubject. If the conductors of the Free-Preſs, will give me a corner, I intend, (God willing) every Saturday, to publiſh an eſſay, until I ſhall have rouſed my countrymen, univerſally to a ſenſe of their condition, or convinced myſelf, that the expectation is in vain. I will not apply the *match* to the *tinder*, which I hope lies concealed in the breaſt of every virtuous Iriſhman; before I ſhall have convinced his reaſon. My firſt appeal ſhall be to the judgment.

That I may proceed with method, and be therefore the more eaſily underſtood by my fellow- citizens of every claſs, I will in this eſſay lay down, as ground-work, the general principles on which I mean to take up the ſubject; and I requeſt that each eſſay may be preſerved as links of the ſame chain.

Firſt, I will enquire by what means any one nation may become entitled to controul over another. Secondly, by what right England claims this authority over Ireland. Thirdly, I will endeavour to do away ſome objections, raiſed by prejudice, and ignorance of the true intereſts of Ireland, againſt the expediency of our emancipation; and laſtly, I will demonſtrate that the preſent moment is the moſt favourable that probably we ſhall ever experience for doing ourſelves juſtice.

And firſt, the *imperial ſovereignty* of any one kingdom over another, *de jure*, is DIRECT NONSENSE. The government of a country can only

be transferred two ways; by the consent of its inhabitants, or by conquest. If a nation consents to be governed, it must be under terms *stipulated*; and in this case the municipal constitution of such country will be *precisely* regulated by the terms of agreement. Here it is necessary to recollect certain principles in the nature of all government---first, that no race of men can alienate, by any act of theirs, the liberty of their posterity; and again, that the delegation or transfer of power must be for the advantages of the *governed*, else it is, *ipso facto*, void. Thus we see that no sacrifice of the interests of one nation to those of another, can exist, even by its own consent. Let us now examine the right of subordination obtained by conquest.

If the conquerors of a nation invade it *unjustly*, surely they have no claim to authority over the conquered. If a ruffian violently, with a pistol at a man's head, should obtain a conveyance of his estate, doth such usurpation constitute right? Such exactly is the title of those who conquer *unjustly*; and it is the duty of the injured to recover their rights, when they can. But the conquerors of a country have invaded it, we will suppose, to recover their violated rights; and their opposers are in the wrong; how far does this constitute a right in the *conquerors* over the liberty and property of the *conquered?* I apprehend not at all. The lives of such persons taking up arms against rightful authority, may, no doubt, be fairly taken away; but their crime will not forfeit the liberty of their posterity, *which is unalienable*; nor their property, which nature appointed to sustain their unoffending children. These distinctions we shall find very necessary,

ceſſary, when I ſhall, in my next, enquire by what right England claims controul over Ireland.

For the preſent, my dear countrymen, I will bid you adieu. Permit me to requeſt that you will carefully peruſe theſe papers. Continue the connection of reaſoning from one eſſay to the next, and decide at laſt upon your own rights. If I ſhall be able to bring my fellow-citizens to unite in one common intereſt, and to purſue one ſcheme of obtaining redreſs, I ſhall hope that the nation will derive ſome advantage from the labours of

16*th April*, 1779. GUATIMOZIN.

---

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER II.

*To the* PEOPLE *of* IRELAND *in* general, *and the* CITY *of* DUBLIN *in* particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

I FIND, that my letter, publiſhed laſt Saturday, has raiſed an hoſt of opponents; who, alarmed at the conſequences of inveſtigating our *independent national rights*, as IRISHMEN, would willingly ſtop all enquiry, by the interpoſition of the ſingle *cabaliſtical* word REBELLION.

The

The immediate effect of the diſcovery of the art of printing in Europe, was the emancipation of the laity from eccleſiaſtical *ipſe dixit*iſm; and a more remote, tho' not leſs ſubſtantial, benefit to ſociety aroſe from the diffuſion of political knowledge, which enabled all men of reaſonable capacity to underſtand their civil rights; and qualified the inhabitants of *theſe* countries, *in particular*, to vindicate the title of every citizen to expound the conſtitution;-----a privilege excluſively exerciſed before by lawyers, who had too frequently the temptation of *leaning towards the prerogative*. Thus the circulation of knowledge produced civil and religious liberty; and hence, to reaſon inverſely, may ignorance be ſaid to be the parent of ſlavery.

I find that a certain Judge, for whoſe opinions in general I have very great reſpect, did yeſterday, from the judgment-ſeat deliver ſomething like a declaration that there was an *illegal tendency* in our *preſent efforts*;----throwing ſome blame on grand juries for the extent of their enquiries; and circumſcribing within bounds limited by *his own explanation* of the grand jurors duty, the objects of their public attention and care.

*Authorities*, in conſtitutional queſtions, I think, in general are dangerous; and, where an authority is unſupported by *reaſoning* and *facts*, I am always for rejecting it.

Grand Juries being compoſed of the principal men of the county, aſſembled twice a year, for public inqueſt, I cannot comprehend any misfortune of the country, of a public nature, which will not conſtitutionally come within their inveſtigation.

tion.----Clear I am that a *conſtitutional Judge* will always wiſh to enlarge the ſcene of their vigilancy. ----Much miſchief may ariſe from limiting their enquiry :---none, that I can ſee, from extending it. The bulk of the people are generally right, and particularly when they diſcover abuſes---But theſe aſſociations, it ſeems, in favour of our own manufactures, and in excluſion of thoſe of Great Britain, are *illegal* combinations ; and the news-papers are *ſeditious* for recommending and ſpreading them. -- I will not be bound to the belief of this doctrine by the *authority of any man*---It is the privilege of a ſubject, living under the Britiſh conſtitution to act, to ſpeak, and to publiſh every thing which is not forbidden by law ; and till the illegality of combining, in favour of our own manufactures, ſhall be unqueſtionably demonſtrated, I will take the liberty to reject all *aſſertional* doctrine upon this head, and to put my fellow citizens on their guard againſt the ill-tendency of ſuch.----- Whenever any man ſhall be diſpoſed to diſcuſs the queſtion publicly, I will enter the liſts with him ; nor do I think it will, in the ſmalleſt degree leſſen the dignity of any perſon amongſt us, to defend publicly a doctrine, which is intended to have a public operation.---We have known a lawyer raiſe himſelf in this country to the judgment ſeat, by the means of a *prerogative pamphlet* only :*--- A news-paper eſſay is a ſhorter kind of pamphlet, and is, in my opinion, full as reſpectable authority for the conveyance of any doctrine.

But, to come to the ſubject of the connection of this kingdom with England, from the inveſtigation of which no authority ſhall affright me. I proved, generally, in my laſt letter, that no country can,

*de*

* Mr. J—— e R—b—n.

*de jure*, exerciſe *imperial ſovereignty* over another. I will now examine the *juſtice* of the claim of ENGLAND, in particular, over THIS country.

If a title to INDEPENDANCE may be derived from *antiquity*, we have the cleareſt preference in favour of this country, by an hiſtorical anecdote of a diſpute for *precedence*, at the Council of Conſtance, 1417, between the legates of Charles VI. of France, and thoſe of Henry V. of England. The legates of Henry prevailed on account of the antiquity of the kingdom of Ireland, of which their maſter was *ſovereign*. But, at this day, people require clearer proofs of independance; and thoſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed on the nature of the two kingdoms.

That the title of the King of England to the crown of Ireland is not derived from *conqueſt* is a queſtion of little or no doubt. It ſtands, thank God, upon a much *firmer baſis*, THE CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND. But, if Henry the Second's title had originated in *conqueſt*, how far does this conſtitute the right of juriſdiction in the Britiſh Parliament? Not at all. The Parliament of Ireland is as compleat in its own juriſdiction, as is the Parliament of England; and the King of Ireland may be the King of England, King of France, or Emperor of Germany, without any prejudice to the ſeparate juriſdiction of the Iriſh Parliament.

The power of conquerors is limited by certain laws, drawn from the nature of civil rights, and digeſted into a ſyſtem called the *law of nations*; and, from the whole ſpirit of theſe it appears, that PRESERVATION, not *ſervitude*, is the end of conqueſt. A conqueſt may deſtroy *national injuſtice*,

*injuſtice*, and lay the *conquered* under a *better* genius of government: but the law of nations, which limits the authority of conquerors, forbids that a nation be made *worſe* by conqueſt. The definition of the right of conqueſt, by one of the greateſt authorities extant, may not be amiſs here. "It "is," ſays Monteſquieu, "a neceſſary, lawful, "but unhappy power, which leaves the conqueror "under an heavy obligation of repairing injuries "done to humanity." In ſhort, conqueſt can rightfully give a King no other advantages but an addition of ſubjects, whom it is his duty to protect, and who ſhould be governed according to the principles of their own laws, or by better, with their conſent. And thus were the words *ſuperior* and *inferior*, with regard to countries connected under the ſame government, underſtood by thoſe univerſal conquerors the Romans, in their virtuous days. CICERO ſays, lib. ii. cap. viii. de Officiis, "*Noſtri autem magiſtratus imperatoreſque ex hac una re maximam laudem capere ſtudebant, ſi provincias, ſi ſocios æquitate et fide defendiſſent. Itaque illud* PATROCINIUM *orbis terræ verius, quam* IMPERIUM, *poterat nominari.*" And ſo the Carthaginians underſtood conqueſt; as we find in TIT. LIV. lib. xxi. cap. v. ſpeaking of the *Olcadians*, a people of Spain reduced by Carthage, "*Ultra Iberum ea gens in* PARTE *magis, quam in* DITIONE *Carthaginienſium erat.*"

If the peaceful reception of STRONGBOW into this kingdom, and the ſubſequent acquiſition of regal authority here by Henry II. may be called conqueſt, we ſee, however, that the power of the King in Ireland cannot exceed the bounds of his power in England. And we ſhall find that the claim

claim of the Britiſh Parliament over this country is a novel uſurpation, not juſtified, as we ſee above, by any right of a conquering people, if *they* even came under this deſcription, nor authoriſed, as we ſhall ſee further, by the conditions of union ſtipulated by the Iriſh, and granted to them by the firſt Norman Kings of Ireland. MAT. PARIS (Vit. Hen. II.) informs us, that Henry, before he left Ireland, met a council of the Iriſh at Liſmore, where, having ſettled the conſtitution of Ireland, the Iriſh received and ſwore to be governed by the laws of England. This ſeems to be the true cauſe why Henry received no oppoſition in Ireland. The Iriſh received a better government, and retained their independency; and therefore PARIS uſes the expreſſion *gratanter receptæ*, ſpeaking of the Engliſh laws. *Giraldus Cambrenſis*, who was with Henry in Ireland, informs us, that by the terms ſtipulated at ſubmiſſion, the people of Ireland were to enjoy the like liberties and immunities, and be governed by the ſame mild laws, both civil and eccleſiaſtical, as the people of England. Here is the only voluntary original compact, between King and people, truly and formally authenticated, of which our hiſtory gives an inſtance. We do not find that the Britiſh parliament, or its authority, was concerned or conſulted in this agreement. There was nothing but the *Regiæ Sublimitatis Authoritas* on the one part, and the good-will of the people on the other; as the Iriſh ſtatute the 11th Eliz. c. 1. expreſſes it.

Very ſoon after this agreement between Henry II. and the people of Ireland, he tranſmitted to them the *Modus tenendi parliamentum*, which Modus

is

is ſaid to have been a copy of that given by William the conqueror to the Engliſh. The original of the Iriſh Modus was extant at the Revolution; and its authenticity cannot be queſtioned; for it was *exemplified* by an *inſpeximus* under the Great Seal of Ireland, in the reign of Henry IV. Regulated by this Modus, were Parliaments held in Ireland under Henry II.---And in about five years afterwards, in a parliament held at Oxford, Henry created his youngeſt ſon John, King of Ireland. This makes a remarkable epoch in the hiſtory of Iriſh independence. For this alienation of the Crown of Ireland, from the perſon of the King of England, rendered Ireland as completely independent of England, ſuppoſing all the rights of conqueſt, &c. to have been then in force, as if the two kingdoms had never been connected.

John, then very young, took immediate poſſeſſion, exerciſing all regal powers, amongſt which are divers grants and charters, by which alone, at this Day, the corporation of the city of Dublin enjoys franchiſes and privileges. He remained King of this country, ſeparately, during a ſpace of twenty-two years, in which time there does not appear a ſingle inſtance of the interference of the Crown of England. After the death of his father, and that of his elder brother Richard I. who died without iſſue, the crown of England devolved upon John, by accidental inheritance. But if Richard had left iſſue, who would have inherited the crown of England, ſurely the crown of Ireland had remained in the iſſue of John, and Ireland would be at this day a kingdom, ſeparated from England in every reſpect whatſoever.

Henry III. who ſucceeded his father John in the government of both kingdoms, granted to Ireland a Magna Charta, which is preſerved in the *Red Book* of the Exchequer, in the firſt year of his reign, eight years before he granted the Magna Charta of England, and the one is a copy of the other. In February following he granted, by another charter, to the Iriſh all the liberties granted by him and his father to the Engliſh.

What are the liberties of Engliſhmen? To be governed by LAWS to which they have given conſent, either by themſelves, or their Repreſentatives in Parliament. Have the Iriſh conſented to the ſeveral Britiſh acts, by which they are now reſtrained? If the kings of England had retained their dominion of France, would the Engliſh ſubmit to be bound by laws made at Paris? I ſhould be glad to have this laſt queſtion anſwered by the Britiſh Parliament. But in ſhort, we are to underſtand that liberty means one thing in England, and in Ireland another.

The parliamentary independency of Ireland, confirmed by three ſeveral eſtabliſhments in the reign of the three firſt Kings of Ireland of the Norman race, remained pure and chaſte, down to the year 1641, when the exceeding confuſion of the government in Ireland, and the impoſſibility of holding a parliament there, laid the foundation of a precedent, which was monſtrouſly built upon in the reign of Charles II. The act of navigation, and the act againſt the exportation of wool, ſave only to England, are uſurpations upon this country, not founded in juſtice or reaſon; and for which I never heard an Engliſhman offer

any

any other juſtification, than that which will as well fit an highwayman; viz.---*the law of force impoſed by a ſtrong hand.*

I ſhould never have done, if I were to quote the infinite examples, during a ſpace of five hundred years, drawn from our own and the Engliſh ſtatutes, of the ſeparate and independent juriſdiction of the Iriſh Parliament. The common law of England became, by the ſtipulations between Henry II. and the Iriſh people, the law of Ireland. Whenſoever a new law was enacted in England, (for, take notice, they have no ſtatute law before the time of Henry III.) if it was found expedient for Ireland, it became immediately the object of the Iriſh Parliament, and then, but not before, it was paſſed by them, became a law here. I defy the moſt enthuſiaſtic ſtickler for the ſupremacy of the Britiſh Parliament to ſhew a ſingle inſtance contradictory of this aſſertion. The mode of appeal, by writ of error, to the King's Bench in England, from the King's Bench here, is no exception. When an Iriſh ſubject appeals from an erroneous judgment here, altho' he goes into the Court of King's Bench in England, he does not apply to any part of the political government of England for redreſs. He applies to the King of Ireland in *Curia Domini Regis*; and if the King, with whom the Court always travels, were reſident here, appeals would equally come from England. The ſame may be ſaid of Chancery, becauſe the Chancellor did always follow the King, as the King's Bench did. The appeal to the Lords of England, in the laſt reſort, was eſtabliſhed by a Britiſh Act of Parliament, (6th Geo. I.) and is juſtified only by the law of force.

Thus, my countrymen, have I proved the violence offered to your moſt facred right, *of living under laws, enacted, or conſented to by yourſelves.* Rights of which you have been in poſſeſſion for above five hundred years after your connection with England, and without the enjoyment of which your conſtitution is politically dead. The age of your tyranny does not greatly exceed a century---that it may not live to be much older, is the ſincere wiſh of

*April* 22. GUATIMOZIN.

---

## To the COMMITTEE for conducting the FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER III.

*To the* People *of* Ireland *in* general, *and of the* City *of* Dublin *in* particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

WHENCE comes it, that in compariſons which call forth the exertions of human pride, a rank is ſettled in Europe for an Engliſhman above that of an Iriſhman? And, why is it, that the men of this country ſeem to admit, at leaſt by a negative conſent, the juſtice of the deciſion? Is the ſuperiority conceded upon a fair compariſon of their relative qualities? Doth the man, born on the eaſt of the Iriſh Channel, inherit from his climate

climate a better conſtitution of mind or of body? Stands his frame upon two more gracefully uſeful columns? And has providence ornamented him with a more beautiful tincture of ſkin, or a more commanding form of countenance? Is an Iriſhman leſs patient of the infirmities of climate? Or, finds he in his breaſt a heart leſs ſuſceptible of love, or of courage?

Habits of thinking, my dear countrymen! have more than realized theſe diſtinctions.----Political inferiority hath, for a length of time, ſo ſunk our ſpirit, that we find in us no inclination to examine our own value, or to queſtion the power which holds us in enchantment. The ſame ſpirit of ſorcery, which hath fitted the *deſcendants of the ancient* SPARTANS to become the *mutilated* guardians of the pleaſures of a Deſpot in a Seraglio, and which makes the *offspring of the* DECII *and* HORATII at this day content with the fame of being the firſt fiddlers in Europe, is operating fatally upon the inhabitants of IRELAND.

If men *will* think themſelves inferior, they will certainly become ſo; and uſurpations upon their various rights will inevitably follow. The people of England improve all the advantages of ſuperiority, which our folly, *of admitting the fact*, makes eaſy to them. Our very pronunciation of their language becomes an object of their reproach, and, by compariſon, of our inferiority; a language, which, conſidering its complex nature, and its migration, could not be ſuppoſed to keep exact pace with its progreſs in the native country, except by a *Babyloniſh miracle.*

It is the peculiar misfortune of this country, that all the inhabitants of it do not agree in the means of making it better. Views of ſeparate intereſts, diligently held up to different parties by our political neighbours, divide the people of this kingdom into factions. If, upon the preſent occaſion, men will not give up their narrow prejudices, and co-operate univerſally *for the one thing needful*, my labours, and the wiſhes of the moſt virtuous patriots among us, will nothing avail. But, if the ſpirit which has lately gone abroad, ſhall operate generally; and if men of all denominations in the kingdom ſhall unite againſt the common oppreſſor, no doubt can be entertained of ſucceſs.

Fortunately our condition exempts us from the neceſſity of doing ſuch things for our deliverance, as our tyrants would call REBELLION. We have only to unite in the plain ſyſtem of *conſuming*, EXCLUSIVELY, *the manufactures of this country*, and the work is done. It is time to exhibit one public act of national wiſdom; and I hope we ſhall not forego the gratification of public revenge, merely becauſe the means of obtaining it are *nationally* wiſe.

In my former letters, I eſtabliſhed upon a rock firm as the foundation of the earth, the imperiality of this kingdom, and the uſurpation of the Parliament of Great Britain upon the rights of our own, by a ſtrong and lawleſs hand. My preſent attention will be confined to the prejudices which prevail with regard to the expediency of our EMANCIPATION.

I know

I know that there are amongſt us many well-meaning people, who entertain apprehenſions on account of the comparative power of England---and I know, that there are likewiſe amongſt us many Scotchmen, Engliſhmen, Revenue Officers, &c. &c. who fail not to improve thoſe fears to the prejudice of our cauſe.---It is, therefore, to people labouring under ſuch terrors my preſent lettter is directed.

The whole of the arguments againſt our emancipation, turns upon three points. The ability of England to cruſh us in an active way; the danger of immediate ruin to Ireland, ſhould the people of England confine their retaliation to a reſolution not to take our *linens*; and the danger we incur of being ſwallowed up by other nations of Europe, ſhould England withdraw her protection. As to the power of England, I cannot comprehend why it ſhould be directed againſt us on account of our intention of conſuming only our own manufactures. The King who is the executive authority in England, by which alone the ſword of war is unſheathed, will ſurely recollect that the kingdom of Ireland is entitled to his protection as much as England, and his Majeſty is too juſt to make war, even upon ſtrangers, without cauſe. But what have we to dread from the power of England, if it were let looſe upon us? The Engliſh are not yet as cruel as the New Zealanders, they will not devour Iriſhmen. But they will ſurround our coaſts with fleets, and cut off our trade. E'en let them do ſo. A ſhot from a ſhip will not kill a man half a mile from the coaſt; this kingdom abounds in all the neceſſaries of life, within itſelf; and as to trade, there is nothing we can part with more eaſily,

ſily, for they have taken care to teach us to live without it. I fancy, my dear countrymen, the Engliſh have got very few ſhips or men to ſpare for an Iriſh war. The Scotch Fencibles ſeem to have, at preſent, very little appetite for foreign expeditions; and if the Engliſh have not learned ſome prudence from their Trans-Atlantic misfortunes, they are more perverſe, and leſs wiſe than I believed they were. England has too great a ſtake to riſque upon the event of a war with Ireland. I think the moſt moderate calculations ſtate the advantages ſhe has by this country at two millions annually, which I believe is more than ſhe makes by the remainder of the Globe. Can ſhe now afford to loſe ſo much? A wiſe agent would adviſe her to compromiſe the ſuit, rather than abide the iſſue. Beſides, will the powers of Europe have no intereſt in breaking down the ſtrength of England, by ſetting Ireland free? The anſwer to this queſtion ſhould make England tremble. The idea of compelling Ireland to ſubmit to England by force of arms, is wicked nonſenſe. Ruin to the empire would inevitably follow the firſt effort of hoſtility; and this alone, I hope, is ſufficient to quiet the alarms of people here on this ſcore.

As to the danger we incur of being ſwallowed up by ſome neighbouring ſtate, in caſe England ſhould withdraw her protection, it is a fooliſh *bug-bear*. We run infinitely more riſque of being invaded by the enemies of Great Britain, in the time of her wars, from which we derive perpetual loſs but no advantage, than we ſhould do upon our own account, if we led peaceably a ſeparate life. Were we removed from Engliſh influence,

we

we ſhould grow rich as Holland has done, and we ſhould be as much ſecured from the effects of general malice, as the inhabitants of that country were, when they ſhook off the Spaniſh yoke. The balance of Europe would preſerve this country free, if it were once ſet looſe. The influence of each particular ſtate would keep it out of the attraction of any one in particular; and the whole would be highly gratified in the downfal of PROUD ENGLAND.

The enquiry, my dear countrymen, into the probable danger to our linen-manufacture, from our preſent aſſociations, I ſhall reſerve for my next, as I find it would treſpaſs too much on your patience, as well as upon the toleration of the Committee of the Free-Preſs, to proſecute the ſubject this day.

I confeſs that, as an Iriſhman, I feel conſiderable gratification in the checks, which the progreſs of England's uſurpations hath received in America. There was a period in the Roman intoxication, when the citizens of Rome paid no taxes whatſoever. After the conqueſt of Macedonia, the whole burden of the ſtate was impoſed upon the conquered countries, and then it was that the provinces looked upon the loſs of the liberty of Rome, as the epoch of their own freedom.

*April* 30. GUATIMOZIN.

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER IV.

*To the* PEOPLE *of* IRELAND, *in* general, *and of the* CITY *of* DUBLIN *in* particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS,

A PERIODICAL author, whoſe intention in writing is to benefit the ſociety he lives amongſt, by opening their eyes upon the true objects of their proſperity and happineſs, will find perpetual advantage from the concealment of his name: the public judgment concerning his productions will receive no influence from the peculiar infirmities or advantages of his perſonal character, and the freedom of the general opinion will direct his future attention to the removal of ſuch prejudices as operate againſt the conviction of the people.

I find that the authority of great names, among us, ſtill keeps alive a kind of apprehenſion that our aſſociations in favour of our own manufactures are not ſtrictly juſtifiable. In general anſwer to which, I beg leave to aſk, if the whole policy of the Engliſh commerce be not founded upon the ſame principle? Is there a ſingle manufacture of Great Britain which is not doubly entrenched in *prohibitory importation* laws?---And ſhall the ſame act be illegal in the people of Ireland, which is conſtitutional

conſtitutional in thoſe of England? Is *blundering* ſo powerfully operative in our climate, that a meaſure which, in England, is wiſe and legal, ſhall in our hands become wicked and inexpedient?

But, ſay thoſe very cautious authorities, you may buy and conſume Iriſh manufactures if you chooſe; it is the declaration of combining which is found fault with. In the firſt place there can be no *illegality*, in combining to *do* that, which, from its own nature, may *legally* be *done*. But, this act of *moderation* is intended to break down our whole ſcheme; for every man in Ireland has long known, and, individually, lamented the phrenzy of conſuming foreign manufactures to the diſcouragement of our own; yet ſhould we have gone on in the ſame courſe to the end, if the inevitable ruin conſequent of the evil, and the inſulting neglect of England at this time, had not drove us to the preſent ſpirit of GENERAL ASSOCIATION, as the only means of relief for our own people, and of puniſhment to our oppreſſors.---- Happy, that the ſame peaceable tenor of conduct ſhall encompaſs two great purpoſes, ſo different in their kind, and ſo deſirable in their end! As long as this patriotic flame ſhall be kept alive, ſucceſs is indubitable: but, if, by any ſophiſtry, the enemies of our national proſperity ſhall be able to extinguiſh it, we will be found to relapſe into our antient, lethargic malady, rendered more obſtinate by having been in vain attempted to be cured. The FIRMNESS of the CONFEDERACY only can S A V E us; and that will very much depend on the warmth of our zeal.

Great

Great offence, I find, my dear countrymen, has been affected to be taken, on account of a declaration in my laſt letter, that *I rejoiced in the checks which England had received in America.* I am far from retracting the ſentiment. I cannot ſee any cauſe of joy to this country in the extenſion of Britiſh aggrandizement. If there were no hopes left us of ſucceſsful reſiſtance to the control exerciſed over this kingdom by the uſurpation of the Parliament of Great Britain; and, if we had evidence that it was the fixed decree of fate that we ſhould always remain in our preſent ſlavery;----I ſay, it is the duty of a virtuous Iriſhman to wiſh to ſee the Britiſh conſtitution deſtroyed, and the King of England abſolute: becauſe the condition of an Iriſhman would be bettered by the change.

Let us ſummarily conſider what is the preſent form of conſtitution in Ireland:-----Like that of our ſiſter kingdom, it conſiſts generally of a legiſlative power, and an executive one. They are ſeverally abſolute in their operation, in each kingdom; and ſhould be ſo, in order to render them effectual. The legiſlative power in England conſiſts of the two orders of the inhabitants; and every thing intended to paſs into a law, muſt originate either from the Lords or Commons of England:---ſo that the PEOPLE ſuggeſt the legiſlative rules under which they are content to live; and the rigorous exerciſe of the executive authority, with regard to thoſe laws, ſeems but to invigorate and give operation to their commands. Such, likewiſe, was the conſtitution of Ireland, from the time of its ſubmiſſion to the crown of England, till it became altered and debaſed in the reign of Henry VII. by the effect

fect of Poynings' law. Since that period, the legiſlative authority in Ireland remains deſpoiled of its moſt ineſtimable attribute, the ORIGINATION OF LAWS. It is now the inverſe of the Britiſh legiſlation; and, in effect reſembles much more the French Parliament, into which the King's edicts come down to be regiſtered, before they become laws.

Such is our legiſlative power in Ireland:---But, behold, what is our executive power! It is a MONSTER, conſiſting of the *King of Ireland*, and *the Parliament of Great Britain!* Can any Iriſhman heſitate in a choice between being a coloniſt of an abſolute King of England, and remaining a ſubject of ſuch a perverted government as is deſcribed above?---A government always the more intolerable, by comparing it with one to which we are equally entitled with our fellow-ſubjects of England. A people ſubject to the will of an abſolute Prince, have nothing to gratify but the paſſions of *one man*; and colonies at a diſtance from ſuch government are, in general, mildly adminiſtered. But who can undertake to pleaſe *ſo many maſters* as we have got in the Parliament of Great Britain, whoſe intereſt conſiſts in the means of our poverty and diſtreſs!

But I will withdraw from a ſcene which exhibits nothing to us but confuſion and reproach; and I will endeavour to diſpatch the ſubject I promiſed for this day, namely, *the probable danger to our linen manufacture, from our preſent aſſociation.* Say the advocates for the imperiality of the Britiſh Parliament, "If you ſhall continue to refuſe the manufactures of Great Britain, you will

 compel

compel the people of Great Britain to retaliate, and you will lose the *only* market you have for the *only* commodity you can manufacture." This subject deserves consideration; and, enveloped as it is in obscurity and difficulty, I will endeavour to throw some light upon it; which, though it may not clearly shew all the parts of it, may yet serve to direct others of my countrymen in the true line of enquiry.

By the accounts laid before the British Parliament within a few years, I find that the quantity of all the linen brought into England, annually, amounted in value to about three millions sterling, of which a million and a half was paid for foreign linen, about a million for Irish, and about half a million for that which came from Scotland. I think it is pretty generally understood that England herself manufactures between checks, huckabacks, &c. &c. for about the value of as much as she imports. Now let us just consider the proportion which *the great linen manufacture of Ireland* bears to the whole of this. It makes about one-sixth part. I dare say there are many very sensible people in this country, who, having never enquired into the fact, imagined their obligations to Great Britain, upon this head, much greater than they really are; and who did not doubt but the people of England were supplied principally from Ireland with all articles of linen, denying themselves the advantages of going into the manufacture, or of dealing with strangers for it, *merely to benefit us.*

Two questions arise now naturally out of the subject.-----First, Why does not Ireland, exclusively,

ſively, ſupply the whole, to the advantages of which ſhe ſeems entitled by the condition of her agreement with England, when ſhe gave up her woollen manufacture? And, 2dly, Is there not great apprehenſion that England will contrive to ſupply herſelf with our ſixth part of the manufacture, from the ſource whence ſhe obtains the other five? To the firſt, I anſwer, that undoubtedly Ireland ſhould be at this day, if ſhe had been honourably dealt by, in poſſeſſion of the excluſive trade to England, and its appendages, in all articles of linen. But the want of due encouragement to the Iriſh manufacture on the part of Great Britain, has limited it almoſt to one province in the kingdom; whilſt a foſtering hand has cheriſhed it in Great Britain, and, the neglect of having ſuffered the duty upon foreign linens to come down to almoſt nothing, has given a preference to the Germans in the Engliſh market. By explaining ſimply the laſt part of this aſſertion, I ſhall nearly clear up the whole.

When Ireland accepted of the linen trade, with which ſhe was totally unacquainted, in exchange for a woollen manufacture in which ſhe had made great progreſs, the Parliament of England agreed to load the foreign linens at importation with a duty of nearly 30 per cent. and to grant a bounty upon the exportation from England of our Iriſh linens, from one halfpenny to three halfpence per yard.---The Dutch were, at that day, poſſeſſed of the linen manufacture; and the duty was laid upon their linens of every kind. The Germans and the Ruſſians manufactured at the ſame time a very inconſiderable portion of a mean linen; and a

duty as inconſiderable, proportioned to what the Dutch paid, was laid upon thoſe goods. Behold how things are now changed! From the operation of this heavy duty in the Engliſh market, (the principal one, I apprehend, the Dutch had) the manufacture languiſhed in Holland, and is now nearly extinct; but the German and Ruſſian manufactures, having laboured under no ſuch burden, took place of the Dutch; and our *humane maſters*, the *Britiſh Parliament*, encourage their ſucceſs, by leaving the duties as they had been at the time they were laid on; ſo that inſtead of 30 per cent. which, by ſtipulation, the foreign manufacture ſhould pay, I underſtand the duties in general do not exceed from eight to ten per cent. and there is a draw-back of the whole duty upon exportation. The conſequence is, that the Germans and Ruſſians are our rivals in England upon equal terms; becauſe the duty they pay is more than compenſated in the cheapneſs of the raw materials at home; and in our colonies, and other markets, to which the Engliſh export, the German and Ruſſian linens find a bounty in the draw-back received at exportation. The bounty paid at exportation upon our linens is confined to thoſe under eighteen-pence a yard; ſo that we ſee even this ſmall encouragement is limited.

Thus it appears, without going further into cauſes, of which there are many, that the want of the ſtipulated advantage, by the heavy duty on foreign linens, operates towards limiting the progreſs of the manufacture univerſally in Ireland; and it accounts for the ſmall proportion which Iriſh linens make of thoſe brought into England.

Let

Let us now consider the second thing proposed; that is, whether England might not be able to obtain *our sixth part* of all she wants where she gets the remainder; and we shall find in this investigation, that a perfect security remains to us in the peculiar nature of the manufacture.

The usual errors, in thinking and talking on this subject, are,---First, that it is generally conceived that most of the linens which go to the English market are Irish; in short, that Ireland is the only linen country:---And, secondly, it is never considered that there is infinite variety in the manufacture of linen; so that nothing is more true than that two countries may live by exporting linen to the same market, without cause of jealousy. Every body acquainted with the manufacture knows, that the Irish fine linens are superior to those of all the world; whilst our coarse linens are miserably bad. The fact is that we have improved the manufacture to a degree of refinement that injures its quality. Our spinners are of the first knack, and our bleachers in the same rank. The excellence of our first manufacture destroys the second.---Our coarse linens are manufactured of a part of the plant called *tow*, which is the residuum after drawing away all the finer parts for the first manufacture. This is what gives a preference to the Russian and German linens in market. They have no superior kind; and they work up all the flax into a coarse cloth, which is durable in the proportion of the quality of the stuff of which it is composed;---it resembles the household bread, from which, neither the fine flour has been taken, nor the bran; and they are both the object of artizans

tizans and hard-working people, who look for duration principally, in the commodity they buy.

Hence it is, that ſo much German and Ruſſian linen comes to England; and I find, by examining the public accounts, for the amount of the drawbacks, that a very ſmall quantity, comparatively, is exported of thoſe linens; ſo that they are principally conſumed in England.

By what I have ſaid, my dear countrymen, you ſee that our manufacture ſtands very clear of the German. Our fine linens will ſtand alone, and muſt be bought, as long as luxury ſhall remain. A century will not bring any other country to the perfection of rivalſhip; and, if we ſold our linens to the Dutch, French, or Spaniards, the Engliſh people of faſhion muſt have them, even charged with a profit. As to our coarſe linens, fortunately for us, they are fitted to a purpoſe which no other coarſe linens will anſwer as well; I mean for STAMPING---a branch of trade ſo profitable to England, and for which the very infirmities of this manufacture give it ſuch a preference, that they would likewiſe be obliged to buy it from ſtrangers at any price, or give up their ſtamping buſineſs, ſhould they think fit to break with us. The ſoft ſpungy texture of our coarſe linen, makes it receive the ſtamp moſt ſucceſsfully; and its lightneſs, flexibility and thinneſs fit it for women's uſe, and for hot climates.

The inattention of the Engliſh to our intereſt is very obſervable in a circumſtance relative to this branch. The Iriſh linens, if ſtamped, forfeit their bounty at exportation, although German linen,

linen, if ſtamped, receives the drawback. From this obſervation,---from the comparatively ſmall quantity of our linens they buy,---from the conſideration that they cannot get any where elſe the ſame linen, whether coarſe or fine,---and from their inattention to altering the heavy duty from the Dutch to the German and Ruſſian linens,---I think it is pretty clear that we owe them no obligation on the ſcore of the linen manufacture; that they would not buy a ſingle yard from us if it were not their advantage; and that we are morally certain of their cuſtom, whether we quarrel with them or not. There are too many of their people who live by retailing our fine linens, as there are who live by the ſtamping buſineſs, to make it a ſafe matter for them to combine againſt our commodity, with which they cannot be ſupplied elſewhere. Our ſecurity is neither in their humanity nor in their love of juſtice.----It is in their ſelf-intereſt, *the firſt principle of an Engliſhman.*

I apprehend they will not go to extremities. They might, to be ſure, diſtreſs this country, as they have done the Colonies, and they would afterwards deſire reconciliation, as they have done by thoſe: But they would, in the experiment, certainly deſtroy themſelves; for, though they ſhould ſucceed in a ſtruggle with this country, they would gain what would yield very little profit for many years.

I ſhould never have done if I were to go through all the arguments, which concur to convince me of their inability to injure us. Stand firm, *my friends*, in the bond of union. The queſtion is, Will you depend for ever on the ſole ſupport ariſing from one precarious, inconſiderable manufacture,

ture, or will you make an effort to obtain the advantages of many? The prize is worth contending for.

*May* 6. GUATIMOZIN.

P. S. I find in the Freeman's Journal of this day, [Thurſday] by the enquiry before the Lords into the affairs of Greenwich Hoſpital, that all the ſheeting is of Ruſſian linen. Hence you may form a judgment of the encouragement extended by *Miniſters themſelves* to the manufacture of Ireland.

---

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

### LETTER V.

*To the* PEOPLE *of* IRELAND *in* general, *and of the* CITY *of* DUBLIN *in* particular.

COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

THE degree of attention with which my poor endeavours in the public cauſe have been lately honoured by you, exhibits a proof, that the accumulated oppreſſions of a powerful and mercileſs ſiſter kingdom, although exerciſed in the extent of tyranny for more than a century, have not yet ſo completely broken down the ſpirit of this country as to leave us content with our miſerable condition.

The

The laſt ſymptom of national abjection, *the apathy of the people*, is yet remote; and, perhaps, when the cauſes which have impaired a conſtitution naturally robuſt and vigorous ſhall be univerſally explored, our malady may find ſome means of relief.

The ſpirit of indignation, which at firſt incited me to labour in the public ſervice, I confeſs, I conſidered ſomewhat allied to Knight-errantry, wherein the deſire of ſuccouring the oppreſſed is infinitely diſproportioned to the means of accompliſhing it; but, like the antient profeſſors of chivalry, I had ſworn to perſevere, although my miſſion ſhould be attended with no other advantage than that of entitling me to be rewarded for my ſervices by the thanks of *the lady in captivity*---the fate of many a courteous Knight.

*Tarda ſunt quæ in commune expoſtulantur*, ſays Tacitus. The ſucceſs however of the enterprize here is highly encouraging: the people are earneſt in purſuit of the knowledge of their rights: and the means of accompliſhing national juſtice appear at once effectual and mild. Paſſive reſiſtance is compleatly ſuited to our condition; and I make no doubt that a very ſhort period of time will demonſtrate the wiſdom of conſuming, excluſively, our own manufactures, by the eaſe and comfort which employment will ſpeedily give to our own people, and by the ruin our aſſociation will bring upon the ſtaple commodity of our oppreſſors.

I have in my former letters nearly gone over the extent of ground laid down in my chart;----the preſent ſhall be employed in a review of the ſubject,

ject, and in the recollection of ſome materials which have eſcaped the firſt enquiry.

The right of Ireland to the advantages of her own legiſlation, and the injuſtice of binding her by the rules of any other, I believe, are demonſtrated: but, what is much more ſubſtantial, it appears that the accompliſhment of our relief from the uſurpations of the Engliſh legiſlature, is practicable and ſafe. I ſay it is fortunate for us that the means of our emancipation are eaſy and in our power; becauſe it appears evidently that we have nothing to expect either from the juſtice or the mercy of England.

The ſources of wealth in every country are derived from the advantages of ſoil (in which is comprehended the quality of the ſurface of the earth, with what is contained in its bowels) the manufactures of the country, with the conveniencies of exporting them; and the fiſheries belonging to the coaſts of the country. From theſe materials, only, can human induſtry draw forth national wealth. It may not be unworthy of our attention to conſider them with regard to Ireland. The enquiry may lead to diſcover the cauſes which have hitherto obſtructed our proſperity.

Experience ſhews that the greateſt advantages of ſoil, climate, and ſituation, and the moſt inexhauſtible prolification in the fiſhing coaſts of a country, will not accompliſh the purpoſes of national proſperity without *manufactures*. We need not travel from Ireland to be *practically* acquainted with the fact, but the examples in aid of proof are numerous. The reaſon theoretically is clear and demonſtrable.

demonſtrable. Soil and climate are only advantageous in as much as they facilitate agriculture, the firſt ſource of wealth: But to what purpoſe will the farmer till the ground if there are not mouths to conſume the produce? The abundance of his crop will frequently prove the very ſource of his misfortune. The idea of a nation of farmers is compleatly abſurd; no country ever did, nor ever can exiſt as a granary for other countries; and although the export of corn may be a great ſource of wealth, in a country advanced, yet it is certain, that no people can arrive at ſuch perfection in agriculture as to export conſiderably, but by the encouragement progreſſively afforded to the peaſant, in a ready and certain market at home, for his grain. This ſource is ever found in manufactures; *thoſe* require the mutual aid of a number of perſons in concert with each other, and *they* muſt be fed. The farmer labours with alacrity, on account of the ſecurity of his market; and the communication with other countries, by the means of the manufactures, opens the way to a foreign market, to take off the redundancy of corn.

So delicate is the connection between agriculture and manufactures, that even the ſucceſs of a country ariſing from the latter, is inſecure where the former is neglected. This has been exemplified in the caſe of ſome great manufacturing cities, as Antwerp and Genoa, whoſe fall from the higheſt exaltation of commercial grandeur was occaſioned by the inſecurity, in the article of bread, which the inhabitants found in the want of a peaſantry. In ſhort, it is a fact not to be queſtioned, that agriculture and manufactures depend mutually

mutually upon each other for ſupport. As to mines, minerals, &c. which a country contains within its bowels, every body knows that the cultivation of thoſe will not take place till manufactures ſhall have conſiderably advanced in a country. I ſpeak not of mines of gold and ſilver,---the ſource of national ruin, not of proſperity.

The very ſame connection, which binds agriculture and manufactures in one common intereſt, will be found to apply between the fiſheries and manufactures. The Dutch derive infinite wealth from the induſtry with which they explore the ocean in ſearch of fiſh, but they abound above all nations in manufactures. Miſerable indeed were the condition of a people reduced to this expedient alone for their proſperity!

From what I have advanced, my dear countrymen, it is clear that two of the three great ſources of national wealth, *agriculture and the fiſheries*, are totally cut off where the *third* is wanting. So that a country, the moſt fertile in its ſoil, with every advantage which can be derived from an equal climate and commodious ſituation, its coaſts bleſſed with an inexhauſtible variety of fiſh, and its inhabitants endued with the advantages of natural acuteneſs, may yet experience all the miſeries of national diſtreſs, and be expoſed to the frequent apprehenſion of FAMINE itſelf, for want of due application to manufactures. And, without changing the courſe of reaſoning, it is alſo clear that a country having the advantages of fertility, of benign climate, and of fiſhing coaſts, may eſtabliſh her manufactures without any difficulty at all;

all; becauſe the natural allies of manufacturers are there already; and from the whole chain it is deducible, that it required *a malicious induſtry* on the part of Great Britain, by wicked management, to preclude Ireland from her natural claim to proſperity in *agriculture, manufactures, and fiſheries*; *the* GREAT AND ONLY SOURCE OF NATIONAL WEALTH.

Let us examine the progreſs of this ſcheme againſt the proſperity of Ireland, and we ſhall ſee that the means by which it has been accompliſhed are worthy of the end propoſed.

In 1698, when theſe countries were beginning to wear a new face, and when the advantages of manufactures were not as well underſtood as they are now; at a period too, when Ireland had, in an extraordinary degree, ſuffered calamities by two recently ſucceſſive civil wars, the Engliſh adventurers in both of which were not unfrequently *repriſed* at the expence of the inhabitants of Ireland, to the no ſmall inſecurity of property here; let us conſider what was the condition of manufactures in both countries. That the manufactures of Ireland were not behind thoſe of England, is pretty evident from the preamble of the Engliſh Act, the 10th of William III. quoted by your ingenious correſpondent *Cauſidicus*, and appears alſo plainly from the anſwer of King William to the requiſition of the Britiſh Parliament upon that head.

" *Sabbati 2 die Julii, Decimo Gulielmi* III.

" *Gentlemen,*

" I ſhall do all in me lies to diſcourage the " woollen manufacture in Ireland, and to pro- " mote the trade of England."

Now, if manufactures were ſo conſiderable then in Ireland, and that of wool particularly ſo far advanced as to rouſe the jealouſy of England, and to create fears leſt their own ſhould be overwhelmed by it, what may we reaſonably ſuppoſe the condition of Ireland would be at this day, if it had experienced fair play? The anſwer is eaſy to any man who conſiders the ſuperiority of her natural advantages. But mark what followed this *cold-blooded Dutch declaration*.---Effectual means were taken in the parliament of Ireland to blazon out the mutual advantages of a compact, whereby Ireland ſhould enjoy "all the advantages and profit which "this kingdom can be capable of, from the linen "and hempen manufacture," and in conſideration whereof ſhe agreed to give up her woollen manufacture. Iniquitous as the impoſition of this bargain was, for which Ireland gave up every thing, and England exchanged nothing but words; let us ſee how far England has even kept her word. They ſet themſelves immediately to turning the whole bargain to their own advantage. They encouraged their own linen manufacture. It is true, they laid a duty on foreign linens, which operates againſt the foreigner, but they provided a drawback of the whole duty on exportation; that is, whenſoever this very foreign linen ſhould become an article of commerce in the hands of an Engliſhman, he ſhould, immediately and individually, at exportation, have a profit of the whole amount of the tax paid to the ſtate by the foreigner, at importation. They got deeply into a moſt profitable manufacture of cheques, and in order to ſecure to themſelves the exportation from Ireland of the yarn for this manufacture, (although nothing is ſo ruinous to a country as to export its raw materials)

terials) they forbid by a law the exportation of cheques from Ireland.----The ſame they did by printed and ſtained linens. When the weight of the foreign linen manufacture was transferred from Holland to the Baltic, they neglected to make a new valuation for the foreign linens, which has nearly ruined our linen trade. The bounty on exportation of our linen from England, is only equal to that of the Engliſh and Scotch, whereby their manufacture has an advantage over ours in a foreign market, by the expence of freight, factorage, riſque, &c. &c. from this to England. They have, beſides, taken care to reſerve a profit upon us paſſing through their hands; for a man living in Dublin cannot carry his linens to England, export them thence himſelf, and receive the draw-back there:---The act particularly ſays, "that no perſon ſhall be entitled to the draw-back, but a perſon *bonâ fide* reſident in England."

They have a bounty of one half-penny per yard on the export of their cheques, amounting to about 15 per cent. upon the value of the Iriſh linen yarn of which it is made; now this may fairly be ſaid to operate as a bounty of 15 per cent. upon the exportation from Ireland of the raw materials of our ſtaple manufacture.----The effects which that will produce in time may be eaſily conceived; and they talk of encreaſing this bounty up to three times the amount.

But all this is nothing, in barefacedneſs, compared to act 23 Geo. II. whereby they have annihilated, at one blow, a flouriſhing hempen manufacture in Ireland, which had been progreſſively

improving for half a century, and the enjoyment of which to Ireland had been ſpecially ſtipulated in the compact of 1698.

Thus has Great Britain, in the firſt inſtance, cajoled this country out of the benefit of univerſal manufactures, by holding out to her the excluſive advantages of the linen-manufacture; and in the ſecond place ſhe has broken every part of her agreement with Ireland concerning this very linen-manufacture. But there is another miſchief entailed upon us in conſequence of this infernal compact of 1698. The union with Scotland has given the people of that country a pretence of right, equal to that of the Engliſh, to live by the plunder of Ireland. The immenſe quantities of kentings and gauzes poured into this country annually from Scotland, and ſhamefully worn by the women of this country, are a part of our national reproach; and leſt an Iriſhman ſhould profit any thing by them, they ſend their own ſhopkeepers, who open warehouſes here, and vend Scotch articles of the linen manufacture in every part of this city. I hope, when they ſhall return home, they will teach their *mobs* moderation, from the example of the mobs of this city, who ſuffer them to carry on this ruinous commerce, againſt the faith of England, ſolemnly pledged in parliament, and do not carry fire and deſolation into their dwellings.

It is a ridiculous queſtion to aſk why they are able to underſell us in our own markets? A country, confined to a ſingle manufacture, and to which that manufacture is dealt out experimentally, partially, and in detail, cannot ſucceed in any thing againſt a country poſſeſſed of the advantages of uni-

univerſal trade. But in truth, kentings and gauzes are not the moſt pernicious commodity imported from Scotland into this country. The men of Scotland, who are over-running us univerſally, are infinitely more dangerous.---I am an enemy to national reflections, but when the people of an entire country are all marked with the ſame diſtinguiſhing features of character, the obſervation on them ceaſes to be called national reflection. Theſe men have a propenſity to emigration, and they carry with them into every country the vices of their own. Religious hypocriſy, ſervility of manners, and political depravity diſtinguiſh them from all the nations of the earth. The only ſatisfaction we have, is, that the principles of theſe Scotchmen in England have contributed very much to the ruin of the Britiſh empire. England has pledged us in the bitter draught.

But I perceive my paper ſwelling along with my indignation.---I ſhall now diſmiſs the ſubject of the linen manufacture, over which the means of my information have been exceedingly limited. I take this opportunity of returning public thanks for the aſſiſtance I have received from ſome patriotic gentlemen, of whoſe perſons I am as ignorant as they are of mine; particularly to a gentleman who left a pacquet directed for me, yeſterday at the houſe of the publiſher of the Freeman's Journal.

I have likewiſe acknowledgments to make to ſome perſons who have made honourable mention of me, in publiſhed eſſays. One gentleman, under the ſignature of *Cauſidicus*, has twice favoured me with his company abroad. I ſhould be proud of

ſuch a companion, if I did not entertain ſome ſuſpicion, that by appearing in the modeſt guiſe of a *ſatellite*, he harbours the malicious deſign of eclipſing the primary planet. By *primary*, I mean literally the order of time. The public, in my opinion, owes him much obligation. The acuteneſs of his judgment, and the cloſeneſs of his argumentation, leave no void ſpace in the conviction of his readers.

And now, my dear countrymen, will you univerſally embrace the preſent occaſion of a non-importation agreement, or will you wait until your oppreſſors, having accommodated matters with the French, and having given up the Americans, ſhall have leiſure to force you to wear what cloaths they chooſe. Their moderate treatment of America, you may conſider as an earneſt of their future humanity towards you---*proximus ardet*-----I once knew a drunken bully, who, in his intoxication, would frequently provoke his neighbours to threſh him, but who never failed to retaliate the blows upon his wife when he got home.

14*th May*. GUATIMOZIN.

To

## TO THE PUBLISHER OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL.

### LETTER VI.

HAVING received by the poſt your paper of April 24, I am perfectly at a loſs to know either from whom, or for what intent it was ſent me; but conceiving that it is meant in ſome meaſure to glance at my public conduct in reſpect to the propoſitions made in the courſe of the laſt and preſent ſeſſions of parliament for the relief of Ireland, and as I ſhould wiſh to ſtand well in the opinion of the world, as well as of the Gentleman from whom I received the paper; ſhall eſteem it as a favour if you will give this letter a place in your paper.----The initials of my name will be ſufficient to ſatisfy the Perſon to whom it is chiefly addreſſed, and the public principles it contains, will ſhew the ſentiments of the independant country gentlemen reſpecting our *ſiſter kingdom*.

When Lord N-------n made his propoſitions to Parliament, it was ſo late as ſome time in April, 1778.---Their extent and magnitude gave an immediate

mediate alarm to the whole kingdom---Scarce a manufacture that was not involved in them.----- The impoſſibility from the late period of the ſeſſions, of a thorough inveſtigation, increaſed the apprehenſions-----and on being informed by the Miniſter that he was determined to paſs them immediately, it became neceſſary to make the moſt ſpirited oppoſition; perhaps in the idea of the trading towns, to put an entire ſtop to the propoſitions ever taking place, but in that of the country Gentlemen, only to give a further time for conſidering the conſequences of ſuch an univerſal overthrow of the trade laws of the kingdom.

It was in conſequence of ſuch an idea, that we moved to put off the further proceeding till next ſeſſions, at the ſame time propoſing, that a committee ſhould be immediately appointed to take into conſideration the whole of the trade laws, ſubſiſting betwixt the two kingdoms, which ſhould in a future ſeſſions be the ground-work of a laſting and equal new regulation, which ſhould then be drawn for the mutual benefit of both.

This propoſition was rejected by the Iriſh Gentlemen in the Houſe with great contempt. ---I dare ſay, their reaſon was a jealouſy that nothing was meant by it but parliamentary craft, to get rid of the buſineſs by a ſide manœuvre, which we could not do by open force, and that they had not any intention of taking advantage of our fears, or compaſſion, by hurrying us into meaſures, of which we neither knew the extent, conſeqnence, or propriety.

A ſyſte-

A ſyſtematical oppoſition was now formed, and parliamentary forms and delays, were called in to our aſſiſtance, (a meaſure I never approve of, when proper opportunity has been given of inveſtigation, and which nothing but the precipitancy of the attempt would juſtify). After ſome time a ſort of compromiſe was made, in which I need not ſay that part of the propoſitions were granted; part put off till a future ſeſſions.---As to my own ſhare, as I did not quite approve the *kind* of oppoſition, I did not attend, nor aſſiſt any further than the firſt ſtep, viz. of propoſing the Committee.

Sir, I will venture to aſſert that the principles of the oppoſition to the propoſitions were not either *unjuſt* or *illiberal*---Scarce a gentleman who did not avow a deſire, nay a conviction of the neceſſity of giving every aid, every indulgence in his power to the inhabitants of Ireland, conſiſtent with that policy, which ought by inveſtigation to be the rule of the actions of a repreſentative of the people.

But, Sir, I muſt at the ſame time declare that we were not equally convinced that the ruinous ſtate of Ireland was to be attributed to the oppreſſions ſhe laboured under from England.----- Was it not rather to be attributed to its own internal bad policy?---Exhauſted of its wealth by its abſentees,---of that wealth, which by a judicious expenditure at home, would have increaſed its means----promoted cultivation----doubled its manufactures,----and enabled it to have traded with England, to an infinite greater extent, than in its late moſt affluent ſtate.

Perhaps

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that Ireland had great merit in providing penſions and ſinecures for ſo many Engliſhmen, and aſſiſting us in the American war.

In both theſe particulars I deny the claim of Ireland to any merit at all. In the firſt, it has only added means to that ſyſtem of corruption, which, like a canker-worm, has gnawed the very vitals of the Engliſh conſtitution, for which we have no obligations.---In the ſecond, it has interfered in a quarrel where it not only had no buſineſs, but where true policy, from the ſimilarity of circumſtances in which America and Ireland ſtand, ſhould have made her rather a mediatrix of peace, than a party in war.---Your preſent aſſociations for non-importation, are the trueſt comment on my aſſertion.

I might demand of Ireland, on what principles thoſe aſſociations are formed? America entered into them, becauſe England violated all her juſt rights, by an open avowal of taxing or binding her by laws to which ſhe gave no conſent.---Ireland has entered into them, becauſe England would not blindfoldly give up her clear, undiſputed rights, to her own colonies, her own eſtates, in the Weſt-Indies, to which Ireland had no claim.

When the propoſitions were made in this ſeſſions of parliament, I will freely own that I think the kingdom of Ireland was not uſed with that candour it ought to have been,---when the broad ground was rejected for a ſpecific propoſal. The ſpecific propoſal ſhould have been accepted or at leaſt fully inveſtigated: but, as Lord North had

had the *merit* of rejecting this propoſal, I am not bound to ſay more of it, than that it had my concurrence, from the circumſtances in which it was introduced, though not quite convinced of its propriety.'

To conclude, I am (and I believe I ſpeak the language of the country gentlemen) perfectly a friend to the kingdom of Ireland, as a perfectly INDEPENDENT, but CONNECTED BY ALLIANCE, kingdom; and wiſh for that kind of union which ſhould ſay, One Intereſt, one Law, one King.

C. W.

---

## To the COMMITTEE for conducting the FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER VII.

*To Sir* CECIL WRAY, *Bart. a* REPRESENTATIVE *of the* BOROUGH *of* EAST REDFORD, *in the* BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

IT will not, I hope, Sir, be conſidered as any violation of thoſe forms, to the obſervance of which gentlemen are bound by delicacy and decorum, that I preſume to addreſs you in this public manner, by your name, and at full length. The neceſſity of the occaſion which prompts me will not be bound in the limitations of etiquette, and the dignity of ſentiment which diſtinguiſhes your preſent

ſent public appearance amongſt us, ſets you, in my opinion, very high above the level of ordinary ceremony.

An Engliſh country gentleman, the repreſentative in Parliament of a free people, and the political guardian of a glorious conſtitution, finds that he cannot patiently bear the implication of a charge that he, whoſe duty binds him to the preſervation of the liberties of his own country, ſhould wantonly, or, what is worſe, from motives of partiality and ſelf-intereſt, annihilate the freedom of another country, equally entitled with his own to the advantages which God and Nature have ſcattered upon the face of the earth; and over which country he can rationally claim no right of control, that may not with equal juſtice be exerciſed over his own, whenſoever the unerring progreſſion of viciſſitude ſhall arm a ſtronger *ruffian* hand againſt it.

Impatience under ſo heavy a charge is natural to a noble diſpoſition; and ſomewhat under the influence of this ſentiment I preſume you felt yourſelf, when you wrote, and ſent into this kingdom, for publication, an eſſay, which appeared in the Freeman's Journal on Saturday laſt; in which you defend yourſelf againſt the imputation of ILLIBERALITY and INJUSTICE in the vigorous parliamentary oppoſition given by you to ſome late attempts towards leſſening the number of reſtrictions, impoſed and continued upon the trade of Ireland, by laws of the Britiſh legiſlature.

Your condeſcenſion in pleading to your indictment at the bar of our tribunal, is an effort of that

that national ſpirit of equality, which has ornamented the Hiſtory of England with ſo many illuſtrious names; and your profeſſions are ſo honourable and kind towards this country as to entitle you, independent of other conſiderations, to the beſt information in our power relative to it; the more eſpecially as you profeſs to ſpeak the ſentiments of the *independent country gentlemen of England*, upon the ſubject.

The foundation upon which England claims a right to bind this kingdom, by laws of her legiſlature, unfortunately for us, has never been laid open.

Judge Blackſtone ſays, "The original and "true ground of this ſuperiority is what we u-"ſually call, *though ſomewhat improperly*, the right "of conqueſt; a right allowed by the law of na-"tions, if not by that of nature; but which in "reaſon and civil policy can mean nothing more "than that, in order to put an end to hoſtilities, "a compact is either *expreſsly* or *tacitly*, made "between the conqueror and conquered, that "if they will acknowledge the victor for their "*maſter*, he will treat them for the future as "ſubjects, and not as enemies."

Let us put this indefinite jargon into preciſe language, and examine the extent and meaning of it.

Ireland, under a right of conqueſt, (*which fact, as to conqueſt, is nearly given up in the ſentence*, "*though ſomewhat improperly*") is become the property of England, to do with as ſhe ſhall think fit; for, by a compact, *expreſsly* or *tacitly*, Ireland has

purchaſed peace, by ſubmitting to ſlavery. It is not a ſtraining either of ſenſe or of language to tranſlate his term "ſubjects" into the word ſlaves; for, his own conception of the relation between the *conqueror* and *conquered*, when applied to nations, and the example of what has happened between the two kingdoms, for which his theory is formed, juſtify the conſtruction. The learned Judge, after having laid this liberal foundation, goes on to build upon it, a ſuperſtructure, ſolid as the baſe; for he tells you, in the next paſſage, that, leſt any doubt ſhould ariſe upon the matter, it was declared, 6th Geo. I. c. 5. *in the Britiſh legiſlature*, that "Ireland ought to be ſubordinate to, and de-"pendent upon the crown of Great Britain, and "that the King's Majeſty, with the conſent of the "Lords and Commons of Great Britain in Parlia-"ment, hath power to make laws to bind the peo-"ple of Ireland." Here is a very extenſive and valuable, but diſputed right, decided by the authority and declaration *ſolely* of one of the parties; and the deciſion muſt be *juſt*, conſidering that the whole benefit of the decree, in which is involved the ruin of the other party, goes to the uſe and benefit of the judge. And behold how magically and ſuddenly the crown of Great Britain is here changed into a multifarious body, conſiſting of the King's Majeſty, and of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain! But when once the ſlavery of Ireland is ſecured by a Britiſh Act of Parliament, Sir William Blackſtone is too good a lawyer to queſtion the legality of the act, or the competency of the enacting authority. What a proſtitution of honour, of principles, and of talents! Yet this, in fact, contains the whole foundation of his "ſovereign legiſlative power" of the Britiſh

tiſh Parliament over Ireland. It were curious to know the ſource whence Sir William has drawn his legiſlative ethics. To you, Sir, it is plain, this reaſoning has loſt its weight; for in the end of your eſſay you confeſs that Ireland is a "perfectly independent, but connected by alliance, kingdom." It remains then only for your conſideration to enquire how far a Britiſh ſenator, at this day, is exempt of the imputation of "illiberality and injuſtice," when he uſes his parliamentary endeavours to continue reſtrictions, which deprive Ireland, as a nation, of every attribute of independency. And I am convinced, to a man of your good ſenſe, it will require very little pains to prove that, when the legiſlature of Great Britain, by a ſtrong hand, impoſed legiſlative rules of conduct upon the people of Ireland, who were not repreſented in their Parliament, but who had at the ſame time a Parliament of their own, whoſe legiſlative rules, however incompatible with thoſe of Great Britain, they were conſtitutionally bound to obey, it was an act ſuggeſted by ILLIBERALITY and executed with INJUSTICE. I do not manage terms when I ſpeak of the actors in thoſe tranſactions; for they are all dead. It becomes the duty of their ſucceſſors, to conſider whether or no they are not parties in the ILLIBERALITY and INJUSTICE of theſe acts, to which they not only continue to give operation, but which they refuſe to repeal, although the ILLIBERALITY and INJUSTICE of them be made manifeſt.

In my letter of the 24th of April, to which yours has reference, and in ſome others, which have ſince been publiſhed here, this ſubject is ſo amply treated, and the plain fact itſelf is ſo ob-



MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY
UNITARIAN COLLECTION

vious, that I conſider it a waſte of time and pains to go farther into it; and will therefore confine myſelf to the matter of your eſſay. You ſay, Sir, that when the propoſitions for the relief of Ireland came before Parliament, "ſcarce a gentleman who did not avow a deſire, nay a conviction of the neceſſity of giving every aid, every indulgence in his power to the inhabitants of Ireland, *conſiſtent with that policy which ought, by inveſtigation, to be the rule of the actions of a repreſentative of the people.*"

A man unacquainted with the Britiſh ſyſtem of Iriſh abjection, would be inclined to aſk *what people* is meant here, when there is queſtion of releaſing, from bondage and miſery, three millions of his MAJESTY'S LOYAL IRISH SUBJECTS.

Do you, as a Britiſh legiſlator, avow the influence of that policy, which would reduce to beggary three millions of THE BEST SUBJECTS in the empire, in order that double the number, in another part, ſhall derive ſuperfluous wealth from their ruin? Let us examine this idea by the principles of Sir William Blackſtone's *ſovereign legiſlative power.*

As a ſovereign legiſlator of Great Britain, Sir Cecil Wray takes upon himſelf the parliamentary care of the people of Ireland. If equal juſtice make any part of the character of a *Britiſh ſovereign legiſlator*, I apprehend that Sir Cecil Wray is bound to be as tenacious of the rights of the people of Ireland, as he is of thoſe of the inhabitants of Eaſt Redford.

Otherwiſe

Otherwiſe this *ſovereign legiſlative power* is a power inſtituted in partiality and injuſtice; I might add that it is inſidious, treacherous, and ungenerous; inaſmuch as this legiſlative care of Ireland is voluntarily undertaken, upon his part, without the requiſition of the inhabitants.

In ſhort, we muſt invert all the ideas, hitherto entertained of *legiſlative* authority, if we ſuppoſe that it confers the power of doing miſchief, without the *concomitant eſſential injunction* to do good.

The Britiſh legiſlature, under ſuch a ſuppoſition, would hold the ſame relation to Ireland, as the Devil is ſaid to bear to mankind.

We are bound therefore to ſuppoſe, Sir, that when you talk of granting liberties to Ireland conſiſtent with the rule which ſhould govern the conduct of a repreſentative *of the people*, you mean to include the people of Ireland in your legiſlative comprehenſion.

The thing is, logically, a perfect dilemma. Either you do comprehend them, and then you are bound as above; or you do not comprehend them, in which caſe the exerciſe of your *ſovereign legiſlative power*, with regard to them, is UNJUST and ILLIBERAL.

A little lower you intimate that "you might "demand of Ireland upon what principles thoſe "aſſociations are formed." I will anſwer the queſtion. The aſſociations of the people of Ireland to conſume, *excluſively*, their own manufactures, are formed upon the principles which ſuggeſted the

ſpirit and letter of the whole code of the trade laws of England. *A ſpirit of monopoly in favour of ourſelves.* Is there a ſingle manufacture of England, linen only excepted, that is not entrenched in prohibitory importation laws? The only difference between your aſſociations and ours is, that yours is ſealed by the *ſovereign legiſlative authority*, ours by the conſent and acclamation of three millions of people.

Your idea that we are angry becauſe of the refuſal of the propoſition relative to rum and ſugars, is not founded in the fact. There is no man of ſenſe and liberality in this kingdom would have given ſixpence to obtain what was demanded upon that ſcore.---I wiſh the reſtrictions of England were directed towards the excluding us from all articles of luxury!

And here, Sir, I muſt remark to you that we have been, hitherto, very unfortunate in this particular. Scarcely any thing aſked for us in your Parliament would have been uſeful. I beg pardon, I had forgotten the *ſource of wealth we are likely to derive from the culture of Tobacco.*

The merit of mantaining Engliſh penſioners, and of aſſiſting in proſecuting the American war, you have, Sir, generouſly given us, without any pretenſions on our part to the credit of either. The penſion liſt of Ireland is at once the reproach of Britiſh government, and a galling inſtance of Iriſh ſubjection.------The catalogue of panders, bawds, ſpies, and informers, German Generals, Scotch pedlars, foreign Ambaſſadors, and Jew Brokers, formeth the motley crew.

As

As to the American perſecution, I can aſſure you, with great truth, that this whole nation, with a very few exceptions, were averſe from it; nor can there be a more ſolid proof, than one that is now univerſally known, viz. that thoſe armies, *which you could not beat in America*, conſiſted chiefly of Iriſh emigrants.

Addreſſes, I know, were procured here, the manner of obtaining which would have diſgraced any adminiſtration, ſave only that one which accompliſhed them. The names of thouſands who had never exiſted, and of many more who had never ſeen the addreſſes, were reverberated upon us in the *London* Gazette. Whilſt the addreſſes of thoſe, who ſought to ſtop the effuſion of kindred blood, were loſt in their paſſage from us.

As to our Abſentees, with whom you reproach us, we have only to anſwer that we ſhould rejoice, if you would make a law to oblige them to ſtay at home; but their ſpending their money amongſt you, ſeems a very odd argument againſt granting us the means to enable us to recruit that ſtrength, of which we are deprived for your advantage.

Of the mode lately inſtituted, amongſt you, to enquire into the cauſes of the preſent diſtreſſes of Ireland, I have an ill opinion---I am ſatisfied it is done for the purpoſes of procraſtination, and deceit only. Three millions of people, whoſe eyes are newly opened on the abuſe of their political rights, and whoſe diſtreſſes are urgent, appear rather formidable, at this time, to a Britiſh Miniſter. The ſee-ſaw, inſidious oration, of the blaſted *Malagrida*, in your houſe of peers, is well underſtood

underſtood in this country, of which he is known to be the ſecret enemy.

It is in vain that you affect to ſeek the proximate cauſes of the diſtreſſes of Ireland. Thoſe ſhe ſuffers at preſent in common with the whole empire; and when you ſhall have diſcovered what it is, which now produces temporary diſtreſs in England, it will equally apply to us. But it is the remote cauſe, which operates perpetually againſt this country, and which, being removed, will ſtill her complaints, and make her happy; I mean the reſtrictions upon her trade.

The removal of this cauſe is within your reach, and the operation will have unerring effects. How can you poſſibly ſuppoſe a great country, like this, to exiſt long upon the portion of a *ſingle manufacture*. I will not call to mind how infamouſly we have been dealt with, even in this one. The national faith ſolemnly pledged in your *ſovereign legiſlative parliament*, in 1698, together with the promiſe of the crown, were not ſufficient to preſerve to us entire, and uninvaded, even this poor pittance of ſupport, for a whole kingdom.

You will aſk how we have ſo long ſubſiſted, and why we are clamorous now? The reaſons are obvious. Diſtreſs has univerſally invaded the empire, the conſequence of an impolitic civil-war, an alienated continent,-- the former ſource of much wealth, and an impaired commerce. Money grows ſcarce, and Ireland is ruined; whilſt Great Britain is only diſtreſſed; becauſe a ſmall matter is ſufficient to ruin Ireland.

If

If one man, in a given number, has been kept for ſome time to a ſtrict and ſpare diet, and if, whilſt he is upon this ſtinted diet, a general ſcarcity ſhall ariſe amongſt the whole number; it requires no great ſagacity to foreſee, that he will famiſh before the others ſhall grow weak.

If you would ſee Iriſh grievances, turn over your ſtatute book. Look for the word *Ireland*, or the word *Penalty*, 'tis equal which; for where you meet the firſt, the ſecond inevitably follows; ſo that you may trace Ireland, through the code, as you track a wounded man through a crowd, *by blood*.

I would wiſh, Sir, in this place, to anticipate an argument very commonly uſed in favour of the claim of England, to uncontrouled power over Ireland. Say they, we protect you at an enormous expence; and pray what would become of you if we did not? I would to God they would try the experiment, and leave us to ourſelves. They would ſoon find that with our *powerful friends* we ſhould loſe our *powerful enemies*. 'Tis on account of our connection with England, that we are threatened. Her protection of us has been eminent during the courſe of this war, when the privateers of our enemies perpetually inſult our very ports.

The protection of England brings upon us the frequent alarm of invaſions, and her wars have carried away thoſe troops which, having been paid and cloathed by us, ſhould, in juſtice, have remained here for our defence. England's protection of Ireland is as treacherous as is the ſhelter

ter of the exalted oak, in the thunder ſtorm, to the unphiloſophic clown, who ſeeks its ſhade. The tree ſerves but to conduct, more unerringly, the lightning's force upon his head,

The policy of England, which keeps us rather in a ſtate of enmity than of friendſhip, is a narrow policy, and deſtructive of its own ends.--- Equal ſhould it be to the Britiſh legiſlator, whether wealth flowed into the empire through Briſtol or Corke, London or Dublin. It would ſoon diffuſe itſelf, and find univerſal circulation.

The thorough-paced illiberality of a Scotch pedlar, or the limited views of a Mancheſter tradeſman, confine them to the ſurface of things; but the man who deviſes laws for a great empire ſhould look deeper.

As to an union now with England, I confeſs I am doubtful of its expediency. Time was that it would have been a glorious propoſition to Ireland---but to unite ourſelves to the vices and the decay of England, when her proſperity has taken flight with her virtues, is an experiment of which no man can promiſe good conſequences

The ſun of England is nearly ſet, but in its meridian height it was to poor Ireland a winter-ſun, the oblique direction of whoſe rays deprived us of the advantages which we ſhould have derived from its proximity.

*July* 2. GUATIMOZIN.

To

## TO THE PUBLISHER OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL.

### LETTER VIII.

SIR,

NOT chuſing to enter the liſts of a literary war with your correſpondent GUATIMOZIN, to whoſe real name I am utterly a ſtranger, but deſirous of a clearer explanation of my motives for my parliamentary conduct, than my laſt ſeems to have conveyed to him; I muſt once more beg your indulgence for the following lines in your paper, unleſs you will more fully oblige me by tranſmitting them to *him*, for whom they are principally intended.

And, firſt, I deteſt and abhor that *dangerous, anti-conſtitutional, tyrannical poſition* of the Engliſh law, that "Ireland ought to be ſubordinate "to, and dependant on the Britiſh Crown, and "that the King's Majeſty, with the conſent of "the Lords and Commons of Great Britain in "Parliament, hath power to make laws to bind "the people of Ireland."--Sir, I ever oppoſed ſuch a poſition in reſpect to America; I will ever oppoſe it in reſpect to Ireland.

But, Sir, I have always been taught, that every branch of the Britiſh empire ſhould contribute to the wants of the whole,-----that this muſt either

either be done by an equal taxation of the branches, or (ſhould that be found impracticable) by ſuch a monopoly of the trade, as ſhould enable the *body* of the *empire*, viz. Britain, to contribute not only its *own ſhare*, but that of the reſpective branches not contributing.

On this principle I apprehended the Legiſlature of Great Britain had a ſuperintending care over the Trade Laws of the whole empire; and, as ſuch, that it was the peculiar duty of every Repreſentative of the people not to conſent to their abolition, without the fulleſt inveſtigation.

As a proof that this was the ſentiment of gentlemen who gave their oppoſition to the Iriſh propoſitions, the queſtion was often put to their ſupporters, If they would conſent, that, on an equality of trade being granted to Ireland, Ireland ſhould pay an equality of taxes? in which caſe its quota would ariſe from *taxation*, and not from *monopoly*.-----The conſtant anſwer was,---NO,---Ireland cannot afford to pay ſo great a burthen on her trade as England does.

I apprehend myſelf to be the actual Repreſentative of Great Britain alone, and that *virtual* repreſentation is a name invented by thoſe who wiſh by ſophiſtry to impoſe on the common ſenſe of mankind, if by it any more is meant, than a repreſentation of many, who, though they are not ranked amongſt the Electors, yet are connected in one common intereſt, and liable to the ſame benefits and impoſitions from the Legiſlature, as thoſe are to whom the care of electing is truſted by the laws.---By this definition, I do not look

on

on myſelf as the Repreſentative of Ireland; and, for myſelf, utterly diſclaim that *ſovereign legiſlative power*, farther than I have before ſtated, and which Ireland admits by a thouſand applications and regulations.

I do readily agree, that Ireland has been unfortunate in the propoſitions made in her favour not being uſeful to her---Is then the rejection of uſeleſs favours an article of accuſation on which to found a ſeparation?---As for *tobacco*, I ſhould as ſoon have thought of giving them a power to grow *ſugar*, which I believe would have been full as efficacious in removing her diſtreſſes. At the ſame time, denying the power of England to prevent Ireland, by any law, from growing hemp either.

In ſpeaking of the penſions on Ireland, I mean, that, if it is an act of State, and not of Parliament, ſtill the Repreſentatives of that country, by holding the purſe, have power to forbid ſuch a miſapplication.---'Tis ſo far then an act of the people of Ireland. On the ſame footing may be conſidered the aſſiſtance given to England in the proſecution of the American war. To the Miniſter be all the merit of the ADDRESSES, GAZETTES, and MISINFORMATIONS.

The policy of Britain towards Ireland, has always appeared to me weak, ſelfiſh and tyrannical. ---Whenever it is propoſed to alter ſuch conduct, by probing to the bottom its wounds---ſhould it then be my lot to repreſent a borough on the terms I do at preſent, viz. the moſt generous and conſtitutional to my conſtituents, the moſt flattering

and honourable to myſelf, (and on no other will I ever find myſelf) juſtice to Ireland, and policy to Britain, ſhall make me ever one of the moſt ready in giving my aſſiſtance to ſo ſalutary a purpoſe.

To conclude; when I ſee your great men immerſed in diſſipation and foreign extravagance,---your commons in idleneſs, and a total want of induſtry,---a part of the people in a ſpirit of perſecution, that would do honour to a *Conclave*, and the reſt in bigotry and ſuperſtition, which would not have diſgraced the followers of *Lama*---a total want of political œconomy in your rulers---ſervility in your courtiers---a readineſs to be corrupted in your patriots, which even an Engliſh Houſe of Commons might bluſh at, I have little hopes of your ruin being prevented.---If the picture is not juſt, your own writers muſt anſwer for it, as from them I have drawn my copy---remove thoſe evils, the effects, ruin, poverty, and diſtreſs, will ſoon ceaſe.

C. W.

LET-

## LETTER IX.

### TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

AMONG the ſeveral uſeful objects of examination, to which your correſpondent GUATIMOZIN has called the public attention, perhaps no one can contribute more to rectify opinion, than the ſubject of the firſt ſentence in his ſecond letter, in which he ſays, that "his opponents would willingly ſtop all enquiry by the interpoſition of "the ſingle *caballiſtical* word REBELLION." I own, Gentlemen, that when I read this ſentence firſt, I was ſomething ſhocked to ſee a word, which I had hitherto conſidered as expreſſive of the higheſt crime in ſociety, treated with apparent lightneſs. But, the conſideration of the tendency of his letter ſoon diſcovered to me that his ridicule was juſtly pointed---not at the meaning, but at the perverſion of the term. Now, leſt ſome of your readers ſhould have felt the ſame ſhock that I did, without meeting with the ſame relief, a ſhort attempt to aſcertain the ideas which ought to be annexed to the term REBELLION may be of advantage to many; particularly at this day, as I underſtand a certain great legal authority * has hinted a latitude in the application of this term, which the common law of the land and the common ſenſe of the people muſt deny. And let not an inquiry

 into

* *Mr. J——e R—b——n.*

into the abuſe of a word be thought trivial, after it has been ſaid by that ſagacious obſerver, *Locke*, "that he, who will conſider the errors and obſcurity, the miſtakes and confuſion, that are "*ſpread abroad in the world by an ill uſe of* "*words*, will find ſome reaſon to doubt whether "language, as it has been employed, has contributed more to the improvement or hindrance "of knowledge amongſt mankind."

The dictionary interprets the word REBELLION, "an inſurrection againſt LAWFUL authority." An interpretation which, I believe, no man, who ſpeaks candidly, and thinks accurately, will heſitate to admit; and under this meaning is certainly included an idea of criminality. Will any man now ſay, that a body of men, *legally* aſſembled, aſſociating to wear the manufactures prepared by their relations, their friends and their neighbours, in preference to thoſe ſent to them by men whoſe intercourſe with them is contempt, and whoſe government of them is oppreſſion, has any tendency towards "an inſurrection againſt LAWFUL authority?" Will it be ſaid, that an aſſociation of men to exerciſe themſelves in the uſe of arms, which by the poſitive expreſſions of their own laws, they are entitled to wear, has any tendency towards "an inſurrection againſt LAWFUL authority?" If it ſhould be demonſtrated, from the authentic records of a kingdom, that certain *reſtrictions* by which it has been impoveriſhed, are *impoſed* in direct contradiction to the municipal laws of that kingdom, to the ancient faith of nations, and to the natural rights of mankind, will any man be daringly abſurd enough to aſſert, that he who demonſtrates theſe things has

has any tendency towards "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority?" If one nation should *suddenly* exercise over another, with which it had existed for centuries on terms of *equality* and unanimity, a controul violent and unprincipled; and insult it by declarations of a right to do so; and if that nation, so oppressed and insulted, should at last rise to assert its own laws, and enjoy its own property, will any man then say that such a rising would be "an insurrection against LAWFUL authority." To put the question, Gentlemen, concisely and finally, will any man involve himself in the perplexity of asserting that an opposition to any authority ILLEGALLY exercised, is an opposition to a LAWFUL authority? If he will not assert this, he must admit that not one of the acts which have been now supposed, includes REBELLION, or any tendency towards it. Yet, Gentlemen, it is a melancholy truth, that the history of mankind affords numberless instances of the misapplication of the term REBELLION, to such acts as I have just now stated. It is the art of tyrants and usurped governments, which has prevailed to gain the assistance of honest but unthinking men, by persuading them that every resistance to their domination was insurrection, and every insurrection REBELLION.

If what I have said shall rectify the opinion of any one man who reads it, let him owe his knowledge to the author of *Guatimozin*. I read his essay with unusual attention. If it did not convince me, it roused me. If it did not direct me *what* to think, it instructed me *how* to think---- When Bacon had gone so far in the service of

mankind, even *his* ardent genius rested.---Until I had read his essay, like the old man in the comedy,

*Jam inde ab adolescentiâ ego hanc clementem vitam urbanam atque otium secutus sum.*

In consequence of this disposition, I had hitherto received many maxims and opinions of my fore-fathers, as I had their estates; considering that the value of the latter, and the truth of the former had been proved already by their industry, and that my course here was to enjoy both without labour or enquiry. But your correspondent has induced me to think that, as an Irishman, I may be poor in the revenue of the one, and ignorant in the knowledge of the other.

CAUSIDICUS.

---

## LETTER X.

### TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

IN my last, I endeavoured to rescue from the perversion of a prerogative lawyer, the word *rebellion*. In this I shall endeavour, to apply to the government of an English Parliament, the word *tyranny*. That a learned Judge should pervert a legal term, that an English Parliament should violate

late the liberty of its fellow-citizens, are ſtrong aſſertions. Yet, as I underſtand the truth of the firſt poſition has already been acknowledged, the demonſtration of the other ſhall not be delayed. To demonſtrate the laſt aſſertion, I muſt admit that power to be lawful, which your correſpondent *Guatimozin* has proved to be uſurped----the dominion of the Engliſh Parliament over the kingdom of Ireland.

If, then, the dominion of this *ſovereign legiſlative* Parliament (to adopt the pompoſity of Juſtice Blackſtone) be admiſſible, it ſtands in a ſovereign legiſlative relation to all parts *equally*, where it is *equally* admitted; that is, all and every part, acknowledging *equally* its ſovereign legiſlative power, are entitled *equally* to the *good* reſulting from that power: I ſay to the good, becauſe a ſovereign legiſlative power to do other than good, that is, a ſovereign legiſlative *right* to do *wrong*, is an abſurdity not to be confeſſed in this century. To illuſtrate this theory by a practical inſtance: If the Engliſh Parliament aſſert a right to bind England *in all caſes whatever*, and if they alſo aſſert a right to bind Ireland *in all caſes whatever*, they ſtand preciſely in an *equal* relation of power to both countries; and, conſequently, ſtanding in an *equal* relation of power to both countries, both countries muſt be *equally* entitled to an *equal* degree of liberty or reſtraint: therefore, every deviation from that equal degree of liberty or reſtraint muſt be a *violation of right*. In a deſpot, where action is produced moſt frequently by ſudden guſts of paſſion, a violation of right, if we look gently on human infirmity, may ſometimes be forgiven: but,

in

in a parliament, where every action muſt be preceded by the forms of *debate* and *reaſoning*, a violation of right may be called a DELIBERATE OPPRESSION; and, a DELIBERATE OPPRESSION, being the moſt perfect definition which the practice of governments ever gave to the word TYRANNY, ſhould not, nor cannot be forgiven.

*---Longum iter eſt, per præcepta; breve et efficax, per exempla.*

My countrymen, I ſhall therefore call your attention to one ſtatute of the Engliſh code of oppreſſion, enacted for this kingdom.

The Britiſh ſtatute 10th and 11th William III. c. 10. declares, that "Foraſmuch as wool and "woollen manufactures of cloth, ſerge, bays, &c. "&c. are the greateſt and moſt profitable com-"modities, on which the value of land and the "trade of the nation do chiefly depend; and "whereas *great quantities* of the like manufactures "*have of late been made, and are daily encreaſing in* "*the kingdom of Ireland*, &c. and are *exported* "from thence to *foreign markets*, heretofore ſup-"plied from England, &c. for prevention where-"of"---the ſtatute enacts, that no wool, woollen goods, ſerge, &c. &c. ſhall be exported, under the pains and penalties of confiſcation, impriſonment, and, in another confirming ſtatute, of tranſportation.

Now, I will ſuppoſe any ſupreme legiſlature had diſcovered that the induſtry of its ſubjects was *daily encreaſing*, that they were *exporting* the fruits

of

of that induſtry to *foreign markets*, and that they were bringing home the wealth and the connections of thoſe markets; I will ſuppoſe that, upon ſuch a diſcovery, this ſupreme legiſlature ſhould direct its ſubjects to ſtay their induſtry, and renounce their connections, and ſhould ordain the pains and penalties of impriſonment, confiſcation, and tranſportation, for their diſobedience; I will ſuppoſe that this prohibition extended only to *one part* of the ſubjects of this ſupreme legiſlature; and that this prohibition was farther aggravated to that one part, by its being avowedly done to gratify and favour the other part.

Now, I will aſk the man, whoſe leiſure and whoſe capacity has enabled him to traverſe the wide extravagance of civilized oppreſſion, when a prohibition is extended only to one body of ſubjects, and at the ſame time is directly and avowedly intended to gratify another body of ſubjects; where both bodies ſtand in the ſame relation of power to the ſovereign legiſlature, is not ſuch a prohibition *a violation of right?* And if that violation of right is preceded by the forms of debate and reaſoning, is it not a DELIBERATE OPPRESSION? And is not a DELIBERATE OPPRESSION the moſt perfect definition which the practice of governments ever gave to the word TYRANNY?

Gentlemen, I have done. On a future day, a further comment on this extraordinary ſtatute ſhall be given. On that future day, I truſt to prove, that the fabric of oppreſſion can only be founded in folly, and cemented in cruelty.

CAUSIDICUS.

LET-

## LETTER XI.

### To the COMMITTEE for conducting the FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

IN my laſt, I explained to the people of this country, the *deliberate oppreſſion* exerciſed over them by the Engliſh Parliament ſince the ſtatute 10th and 11th William III. I then pledged myſelf to continue a comment on this extraordinary ſtatute. And I truſt the ſtrong lines of folly and cruelty, which diſtinguiſh the hardened features of this act of oppreſſion, will not require a microſcopic viſion in my readers to diſcern.

The preamble of the ſtatute 10th and 11th William III. c. 10. declares, as was mentioned in my laſt, but is neceſſary to repeat here, "that foraſmuch as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, ſerge, bays, &c. &c. are the greateſt and moſt profitable commodities, on which the value of lands, and the trade of the nation do chiefly depend; and whereas great quantities of the like manufactures have of late been made, and are daily increaſing in the kingdom of Ireland, and

are

are exported from thence to foreign markets, heretofore ſupplied from England, which will inevitably ſink the value of lands, and tend to the ruin of trade and the woollen manufactures of this realm; for PREVENTION whereof, &c. no perſon, &c. ſhall directly or indirectly, &c. ſhip off or export any wool, woollen manufactures, drapery, ſtuffs, &c. (S. 11.) under the penalty that all and every offender, &c. ſhall be ſubject to the reſpective pains, penalties and forfeitures, hereafter, &c. that is forfeiture of ſhip, &c. and of 500l. for every offence; and of 40l. by every boatman, porter, &c. aſſiſting in carrying, &c."

Permit me now to put the ſpirit and the principles of this preamble, and theſe penal clauſes into a fair point of view for the good people of Ireland; and if, in attempting it, I ſhall falſify that ſpirit, or thoſe principles, I give up all claim to public attention. I ſay then, that a ſovereign legiſlature aſſerting a right to bind its dominions *in all caſes whatever*, is anſwerable in all caſes whatever for the proſperity or miſery of the people contained within its ſovereignty: and that wiſdom will be the praiſe, and folly be the ſatire pronounced upon it, according to the degree of proſperity or miſery accruing from its laws.

While I put into ſovereign *legiſlative language* the certain conſequences deducible from the poſitions laid down in this ſtatute, mark its wiſdom in its intended effects.

" Foraſmuch as wool and woollen manufactures of cloth, ſerge, bays, &c. are great and profitable commodities, on which the value of lands, and the

the trade of nations, where the materials for ſuch manufactures are produced muſt chiefly depend; and whereas great quantities of the ſaid woollen manufactures, &c. have of late been made, and are daily increaſing in our dominions, [Ireland] and are exported to foreign markets, which will inevitably raiſe the value of lands, extend the trade, and encreaſe the population of this our realm of Ireland, for PREVENTION *whereof*, all and every perſon *offending*, by attempting to aid this riſe on the value of lands, this extenſion of trade, and encreaſe of population, ſhall be ſubject to the pains and penalties of impriſonment, confiſcation, &c."

Has it ever been held WISDOM in a legiſlature to encreaſe the trade, the numbers, and the wealth of its people? If ſo, is not ſuch a prevention FOLLY? And did the folly of ſovereignty ever ſtalk in ſuch glaring robes as this deliberate folly of the Engliſh Parliament? But it will be ſaid, perhaps, that however fooliſhly this Parliament may have acted to Ireland, they were moved towards it by a particular bias; and that they had a ſuperior intereſt to guard, the vein of which will effectually vindicate their determinations from the charge of *folly*. Be it ſo:---The folly of ſuch a prevention ſubſiſts in its effects, though denied to belong to the Engliſh Parliament. For if, from any bias, or ſuperior intereſt, it ſhould not appear to be folly in them to enact ſuch laws, muſt it not be *folly* in any nation to endure a legiſlature ſo biaſſed and ſo intereſted?

Inconſiſtency is but a modification of folly; and the conſiſtency of this wiſe Parliament ſhall be diſ-

played

played by contraſting the preamble of another ſtatute with the one juſt now mentioned.

The 12th Car. II. recites, " For the better preventing all ſuch loſſes as have happened to the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, and to the kingdom of IRELAND by the ſubtil and ſecret exportation and tranſporting of wool, woolfells, &c. (other the *raw* commodities) *and for the better ſetting on to work the poor people and inhabitants of the kingdoms aforeſaid*, [Ireland] and to the intent that the *full uſe and benefit* of the principal and *native commodities* of the ſame kingdoms [Ireland] may come and be unto the ſubjects and inhabitants of the ſame; [Ireland] and not unto or amongſt the inhabitants of the realm of SCOTLAND, or any other *foreign* realm or ſtate: No perſon within the ſaid dominions of *Ireland*, Wales, or England, ſhall export the ſaid *raw* commodities, under the penalties contained in the ſaid act."

By the preamble of this laſt ſtatute, the avowed motive of its reſtrictive clauſes appears to be the *better ſetting on to work* the poor inhabitants of the kingdoms, (amongſt them Ireland) and that they ſhall not be deprived of the benefit of working up their *native commodities:* and by a neceſſary conſequence, that they ſhall be encouraged (in Ireland as well as in England) to raiſe the value of their lands, to extend their trade, and encreaſe their population. Now, mark the conſiſtency of this ſovereign legiſlative Parliament! By the Act of Charles, we are prohibited from exporting our *raw* commodities, in order that we may find employment at home in manufacturing By the Act

of William, we are prohibited to uſe or enjoy that manufacture, which by the other we are encouraged to prepare. Is not this inconſiſtency? And can inconſiſtency in a ſovereign legiſlative Parliament take a milder term than *folly?*

The Parliament of Charles *uſurped* a power over Ireland, which, although they *uſurped*, they exerciſed in *this* ſtatute for wiſe and beneficent ends. The Parliament of William following the precedent of uſurpation, exerciſed their power in *every* ſtatute relating to Ireland, to attain ends which could only be fought by folly, and ſuggeſted by inhumanity. The compariſon of theſe ſtatutes adds one example more to the many which hiſtory affords, where the worſt precedents were eſtabliſhed in the beſt cauſes; and where the very *preſent utility* of the end ſanctified the *future miſchief* of the precedent.

I have now gone through the folly which floats upon the *ſurface* of this ſtatute. To develope the *body* will require another day. When that body comes to be diſplayed, it will appear to maintain its ſolidity by the combination of numberleſs ſeparate atoms of *cruelty*, all mutually attracted and ſupported by each other.

CAUSIDICUS.

LET-

# LETTER XII.

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING finiſhed, in my laſt letter, my obſervations on the *folly* of the Engliſh ſtatute William III. c. 10, the original plan which I propoſed wants nothing towards its execution, but to ſhew the cruelty by which the folly of that ſtatute has been carried into oppreſſive execution. Sect. 3. of that act enacts, that no acquittal, indictment, &c. (*unleſs the offender be thereupon* CONVICTED) in Ireland, for any offence provided againſt in this act, ſhall be pleaded or allowed in bar *or delay* of any indictment, information, ſuit, or proſecution, within the kingdom of England. ---Sect. 20. ſame act enacts, That every perſon may be proſecuted for any offence within this act, in the *courts of Weſtminſter*, and, upon a capias iſſuing out of any ſuch court, the perſon proſecuted ſhall be obliged [redacted] *good and ſufficient bail of natural-born ſubjects*, &c. By 3 G. I. c. 21. it is enacted, That, for the *better and more impartial* trial of the aforeſaid actions and informations, they ſhall be tried in any But his Majeſty's four-

 courts

courts at Dublin, by a jury, &c. to be ſummoned out of any *other* county than that, wherein the fact ſhall be committed. By 5 G. I. c. 11, All wool, &c. laid near the ſea, or any navigable river, ſhall be forfeited.

It was once a principle of penal law here, that no man ſhould be tried above *once* for the ſame offence. The iniquity of the affirmative of ſuch a rule is ſo glaring, that no governments, even the moſt arbitrary, ſave only this ſovereign legiſlative parliament, have attempted it. It was once a principle of conſtitution here, that every offence ſhould be tried by the neighbourhood of that place where it was committed. The bleſſing of ſuch a conſtitution is ſo evident, that no country, even the moſt inſenſible, ſave only Ireland, ever *quietly* ſurrendered it, after it had been known and enjoyed. But, now, view the ſum of Iriſh liberty and Engliſh juſtice aggregated in thoſe clauſes----An Iriſhman ſhall be tried in Ireland by a jury, ſummoned out of any *diſtrict* in the kingdom which the *proſecuting* party ſhall nominate: And it is a known fact, that the crown could by this power try a *forfeiture* cauſe by a jury of *cuſtom-houſe officers*. But if, through the influence of ſome undiſcerned ſpark of integrity remaining unſmothered by the profeſſion of theſe officers, he ſhould be acquitted, he ſhall be afterwards ſeized in the *free realm* of England, and confined in a common priſon, unleſs he can find ample bail in a country where he muſt be conſidered a ſtranger: he ſha[illegible] tried in that country where he lies an unfriended ſtranger, for an offence not alledged to be committed within 500 miles diſtance; and, if his circumſtances will not permit

permit him to bring witneſſes, from that diſtance of 500 miles, to diſprove his guilt, his goods ſhall be confiſcated, he ſhall ſuſtain a heavy fine, and his perſon ſhall be impriſoned. But farther: If within a limited time his unconfiſcated property ſhall not anſwer the inflicted fine, "he ſhall "be tranſported to the plantations." So that, in this laſt clauſe, his poverty, which in every other country would be conſidered a mitigation, becomes an aggravation of his tranſgreſſion. And, by the clauſe in 5 G. I. in the wantonneſs of power, they carry their tyranny to our very doors: for, by that ſtatute, a gentleman of Ireland, if he ſhould happen to reſide within their idea of the words near to the ſea or any navigable river, dare not lay the produce of his own demeſne at the door of his own houſe, under penalty of forfeiture. A wretch, born to ſlavery and to poverty, unconſcious of affluence and of freedom, is not ſuch an object of compaſſion, as the man who, having grown to maturity in the enjoyment of the latter, is precipitated by violence or by perfidy to the loweſt ſtage of the former. Yet this is the ſtate of Ireland: And this precipitation, from it ancient rights, I call the cement of *cruelty*, which binds the fabric of *oppreſſion* raiſed over it by the hands of *folly*.

I have now, Gentlemen, dragged the Cacus from his den. Though I uſe this metaphor, I do not boaſt an Herculean labour---the houſe of civil tyranny was more eaſily attained than the cave of ſavage depredation: for through the intricacies of Engliſh law the gradation of Ireland may be traced, as the way of a wounded man, by the blood which follows it. But, though the monſter

is brought to light by a ſingle ſtrength, it is only in the activity of the many to hunt him *even unto the death*. To ſpeak in plainer terms, it is in the people only, and the people *united* in their efforts, to rid themſelves of the tyrannic diſpoſition in this *ſovereign legiſlative parliament*. Againſt any attempts towards gaining ſuch an union of efforts in the people, I am ſenſible many arguments will be urged. The probable danger of the means will terrify thoſe who acknowledge the certain utility of the end. In truth, I apprehend this laſt ſentence contains the amount of all that can be ſaid againſt the attempt to gain our rights. If, therefore, it can be demonſtrated that from the *peculiar nature* of the dominion which England has raiſed over Ireland, an end certainly uſeful can be attained, by means not probably dangerous, none even among the moſt timid will, I hope, heſitate to apply thoſe means.---This is not the dominion of armed Rome, ſtrong from her diſcipline, and from her *poverty independent* in that ſtrength: England may be ſaid to be armed, and ſtrong from her diſcipline; but her arms and her diſcipline are *dependent* on her *wealth*. Arms and diſcipline only could conquer Rome; but a deprivation of *wealth* would ſubdue England. If America had not *choſen* to proceed by violence, ſhe might have emancipated herſelf without a blow. The dominion of England over Ireland is England's *profit*, not her *glory*. Remove that *profit*;---her dominion becomes a ſound. But, how, remove that profit? *Wear your own manufactures*; ASSOCIATE. By that word, ſhe may be beaten without fighting, and ſubdued without conteſt. Thus the ends of war may be attained by the inſtruments of peace.

As

As the power of England is ſupported by her wealth, and as that wealth is accumulated by commerce, and as her trade with Ireland *now* contains a principal part of that commerce, Ireland may be ſaid to hold *the key* of ſuch a proportion of her wealth as her trade of Ireland bears to her univerſal trade. Ireland then ſtands as to England, for ſo much wealth, preciſely in the ſame relation that the houſe of commons of England, ſtands to the crown of England. The crown is powerful, if the commons grant ſupplies; nevertheleſs, without that grant, let Ireland ceaſe her conſumption of Engliſh manufactures, the cauſe of that *profit* which is the eſſence of this dominion, and the power of England, like the *unarmed* hand of Majeſty, can terrify only in its name.

CAUSIDICUS.

## TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CONDUCTING THE FREE-PRESS.

## LETTER XIII.

*To Mr.* JUSTICE R----B----N, *one of the Puiſne J--dg---s of his Majeſty's C-----t of K-----'s B----h.*

SIR,

ON Monday laſt you were pleaſed to *interrupt* the buſineſs of the court of K. B. in order to cenſure the High Sheriff of the city of Dublin, whom you accidentally ſaw then in court, for what you were pleaſed to call his *miſconduct* in convening the citizens of Dublin, previous to their entering into reſolutions to conſume excluſively the manufactures of this kingdom. You thought proper to declare on that occaſion, that ſuch a convening, on the part of the Sheriff, was acting *contrary to his duty*, and that the aſſembly, ſo convened by him, was an *unlawful* aſſembly. Sir, I regard the regularity with which the buſineſs of the public ſhould proceed, too much, to queſtion in a news-paper, the judgment of a court of juſtice pronounced in a cauſe *at hearing* before it. If ſuch a judgment ſhould be grievous, there is a better remedy than that of cenſuring it in a public paper.----But, the attack made by you on the High

High Sheriff was not a judgment of a court of juſtice, but an obiter opinion of J----- R-------. The legal foundation upon which you reſt your opinion, that the Sheriff acted contrary to his duty, when he convened the aggregate body, which hitherto has been done at the requiſition of a certain number of the Freemen, I ſuppoſe you will explain, and I think it is your duty to do ſo: Firſt, becauſe your doctrine, delivered laſt Monday, contradicts the commonly received opinions of the public upon this head; ſecondly, becauſe you have (however extrajudicially) delivered this opinion under the exerciſe of an authority which conſtitutionally belongs to your court, and ſhould therefore be ſupported by *law*; and, moſt of all, becauſe I do declare to your fellow citizens, that the opinion which you then delivered has no foundation either in the *common law*, or in the *ſtatutes*.

Whatever is not forbidden by law may legally be done. The Sheriff is not forbidden to convene the Freemen, therefore the Sheriff in ſo doing does not act contrary to his duty. It lies upon you to ſhew *where* the Sheriff is forbidden to convene his fellow-citizens. His authority to call them together is eſtabliſhed by immemorial cuſtom, as well as by the nature of his office. If Freemen may legally aſſemble, their public officer ſurely is the Sheriff, and as he is the "*keeper of the King's peace*," he can be no where more conſtitutionally employed than in regulating or ſuperintending the proceedings of his fellow-citizens, aſſembled together for the purpoſe of conſtitutional diſcuſſion.

But

But you went further; you declared the Aggregate Body *an unlawful aſſembly*.

Lord Coke ſays, "An unlawful aſſembly is when three or more do aſſemble to do an *unlawful act*." 3 Inſt. 176.

The intent of the parties here obviouſly conſtitutes the crime; otherwiſe a dozen people going to church, if any accident happened, might be deemed from the beginning an unlawful aſſembly. Now it reſts with you to prove that it is an *unlawful act*, for three or more Iriſhmen to reſolve to conſume the manufactures of their brethren, kindred, and friends, in excluſion of the manufactures of their enemies and oppreſſors. If you cannot prove this, it follows that the intent which brought together lately the Aggregate Body was *lawful*, their aſſembly *lawful*, and your extrajudicial opinion *was not law*.

But it is expedient likewiſe that you inform the public what is, and what is not, an unlawful aſſembly of the people; for, by your indefinite, *extrajudicial* cenſure, it would ſeem that the people can never aſſemble *lawfully*.

I will ſuppoſe a caſe, extremely grievous indeed, and I will beg your opinion upon it, as you are ſo willing to give it *extrajudicially*:---Suppoſe a Barriſter, to have made his way to a ſeat on the Bench of the criminal judicature, by means highly ſuſpicious, not to ſay odious to the people, viz. by having flattered the power of the Crown in a prorogative pamphlet; and ſuppoſe this Judge, during

during a ſeries of years, to have employed what little talents God gave him to the perverſion of all legal principles, the violation of all private right, and to the diſgrace of public decorum.---- Suppoſe him a man whoſe malignity is only bounded by the narrowneſs of his capacity, and whoſe cruelty finds no limits but in the weakneſs of his power; a man who, in the place of the ſteady temper of liberal juſtice, has ſubſtituted the uncertain peeviſhneſs of diſappointed ambition; and for the ſound diſcrimination of a Britiſh Lawyer, has conſtantly diſplayed the craft and involutions of a *Jeſuit*.-----A man who has been obſerved to be always negligent, except when rouſed by anger; and undiſcerning, but when he is ſharpened by malice.------One who, while he followed the profeſſion of a Lawyer, was too much deſpiſed by the people to be employed by them; and who never appeared as an *Advocate*, until he became a *Judge*.

If a man, anſwering to this deſcription, ſhould have unfortunately found his way to the ſeat of criminal juriſdiction; and if the people (after a waſte of 22,000l. paid him in ſalary, and a toleration of him for twenty-one years, in which they vainly hoped that experience might have enlarged his underſtanding, and age might have moderated his paſſions) ſhould find at laſt that experience had only taught him new methods of gratifying the malice which his years now rendered capricious; and of indulging a ſyſtem of peeviſhneſs, which infirmities had made conſtant in him;---I deſire to be informed by Mr. J----- R-------, if, in ſuch a dilemma, the people would not be juſtified,

juſtified, ſhould they meet to inſtruct their parliamentary repreſentatives to procure the conſtitutional removal of ſuch a man; and if, in ſuch caſe, *he* would venture to call the Aggregate Body an *unlawful Aſſembly?*

CAUSIDICUS.

THE END.